

INTRODUCTORY SKETCH
of the
HISTORY OF THE SHANS

in
UPPER BURMA AND WESTERN YUNNAN



คณะอนุกรรมการวิจัยวัฒนธรรมภาคเหนือ
สำนักงานคณะกรรมการวัฒนธรรมแห่งชาติ

INTRODUCTORY SKETCH
OF THE
HISTORY OF THE SHANS
IN
UPPER BURMA AND WESTERN YUNNAN.

BY
N. ELIAS,
ATTACHÉ, FOREIGN DEPARTMENT,
GOLD MEDALLIST, ROYAL GEOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY.
CORRESPONDING MEMBER: GEOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY: BERLIN.



CALCUTTA:
PRINTED AT THE FOREIGN DEPARTMENT PRESS.
1876.

NOTE.

In the proper names throughout the following pages, the vowels are to be pronounced as in Italian and the consonants as in English, with the exception of well-known words such as *Hindoo*, *Salween*, &c., or places in British territory. The one exception in the vowel sounds is that of *aw* which remains as in the English word *flaw*, there being no Italian equivalent for that sound.

The date of the commencement of the Buddhist or Religious Era has been taken, as has hitherto been usual, at 543 B.C., though I am aware that the result of recent researches tends to place it somewhat later.

O'er these vast regions see a varied throng
Of thousand unknown nations crowd the coast;
The Laos both in lands and numbers strong,
Avas and Birmahs in their mountains lost,
And savage Gneos, scarcely seen among
The deep recesses, where the barbarous host
On human flesh with brutal hunger feed,
And with hot iron stamp their own—rude deed!

Camoëns. *Lusiadas*, Cant. x., cxxxvi.
(Sir J. Bowring's *Siam*, Vol. II., p. 1.)

INTRODUCTORY SKETCH
OF THE
HISTORY OF THE SHANS
IN
UPPER BURMA AND WESTERN YUNNAN.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

THE following brief notes on the history of the northern section of the Shan or Tai race were collected at Mandalay during the summer of 1875, almost entirely through the instrumentality of a well-read Hindoo Moonshee named Raj Sing, of the Chettry caste and belonging to Seeb-saugor in Upper Asam. Having ascertained by chance that he had previously given a good deal of care to the collection of historical notes of all kinds, and had been in the habit of recording them carefully in his own language, I engaged him to give me verbal abstracts of those concerning the Shans in English, omitting the fabulous portions; and also, to fill up the many voids they then contained, by consulting the Shan priests resident at Mandalay, and others who had a knowledge of their books. In this way, not only were several Shan histories put under contribution, but a number of Burmese translations of Shan books were examined, and their contents made available either as original material or as the means of rectifying uncertain points derived from the more direct sources: while native Burmese and Asamese

works were also utilised for reconciling doubtful dates or events with well-ascertained historical facts in the annals of those countries. Thus the story below is not a translation of any particular work, but an outline sketched from a variety of sources.

My own entire ignorance of the Tai language, and having therefore to rely on double interpretation, is a serious disadvantage, and will, I am conscious, always leave the authenticity of any new fact brought forward open to question; but in first attempts of this kind to obtain glimpses of the history of little-known and, to a great extent, inaccessible people, much must of necessity be left to "native information," and the aim of these notes must in consequence be confined to giving a rough sketch of the subject, which may at best serve some future explorer in the same field as a faint track to guide him towards more perfect investigations.

And, indeed, they are confined to only one section of that great Tai race which spreads, by one name or another, from the valley of Asam in the west, over nearly the whole of further India and far into the interior of China. This section it is difficult to name, but it may perhaps be most simply described, according to modern usage, as the Shans proper, or those who inhabit, generally, the northern and eastern hill tracts of Ava and the western districts of Yunnan, and who have, at the present day, no distinguishing national name as a whole,* such as the Laos, the Ahoms, &c., or even the Siamese (Ayudia Shyam or Shan), but who were formerly members of one extensive country composed of several states or provinces dependent on a central kingdom, the ruler of which held paramount power over all. A native name for this collection of states in the aggregate seems to be wanting, but the paramount kingdom being the home of the branch, or tribe, of Shans called the Mau, this region was named by them Mung-Mau, or the country of the Mau; in Burma, however, the classical (Buddhistical) name of

* The Pa-I of the Chinese and Shan-gyi, or great Shans, of the Burmese. They sometimes speak of themselves as Tai-lung or great Shans, but this is no real distinction. The Siamese are said to speak of them as Tai-güt or left-behind Tais (*i.e.*, those who did not come to Ayudia and form a kingdom); to the Asamese they are known under the name of Sam; to the Munnipuris as Kapo (Kubbo) or Pong, &c.

Kusambi,* one of the most celebrated cities of ancient India, was applied to it, while the Munnipuris and perhaps some of their immediate neighbours in Cachar, Tipura, &c., knew it as the Kingdom of Pong, or Bong, and possibly, in some instances, may have used the name of Pong in the more extended sense for the entire country or collection of states.

The position and boundaries of the ten Maings of Kusambi (see note*) are fairly well known and may be assumed to embrace the modern Chinese Shan States of the same names and also to have extended further towards the east than these—perhaps as far as the Salween. The boundaries of the entire country it is almost impossible to lay down, firstly, on account of the fabulous and, perhaps, vain-glorious way in which they are indicated in the native writings, and secondly,

* This name, from the time of Buchanan-Hamilton, who was in Ava in 1795, down to the present day, has been misconstrued into a Burmese combination of *Ko-Shan-pyi*, and interpreted to mean "nine Shan States." It is, however, merely the classical or adopted name for Mung-Mau which was, it so happens, at some periods composed of nine *Maings* or Provinces though usually of ten. These were (1) M. Mau; (2) M. Ti; (3) M. Wun; (4) M. La; (5) Sanda; (6) M. Sa, afterwards divided into Ho-Sa and La-Sa; (7) Si-Kuen—a place I cannot identify; (8) Momien; (9) Sei-fan. A part of Wan-Chang or Yungchang is sometimes given, but this is doubtful and is probably meant for M. Shé or as it is generally written M. Kwan.

The *Peking Gazette* of 30th August 1873 gives eleven Shan states, all subject to Yungchang-fu, as follows Mêng-Ting (a prefecture); Wan-tien (a department); Chen Kang (*ibid*); and the Tsaubwaships of Tsien-yai; Lungchwan; Chei-fang; Sanda; Lulian; Mang-she; Nan-tien; Mêng-mau.

By a strange coincidence of names—from which, however, I can see nothing to be derived—General Cunningham (*Ancient Geogr. of India*, p. 399) speaks of two ghauts on the Ganges opposite the present Allahabad, 40 and 43 miles, respectively, from Kusambi, called *Mau-Saraya* and *Papa-Mau*. Though there can be little doubt that *Mau*, as used in *Mung-Mau*, is a native Tai name and not, like Kusambi, derived from ancient Indian geography, still my attention was drawn to the word *Papa* in connection with it, and with the tribe and country of *Pape* or *Pape-Sifu*, names by which one of the independent states on the border of Yunnan was formerly known to the Chinese, and the position of which, according to Ritter (IV., pp. 763-4) at first sight points somewhat to *Mung-Mau*. There is, however, no connection in reality, and the country of the Pape must be looked for further towards the south. Indeed, there is some probability of the Pape being represented by the Karens, for I find the various Karen Chiefs are, to the present day, known to the Burmese by the Sanscrit title of *Papa Deva Raja* (God-like King of the Hills?), while one of them is named *Pyaphei* and another *Phaphay-ayay* (according to the Burmese spelling) in addition to the title of Papa Deva Raja. Further, Ritter tells us (p. 765) that the Pape called themselves *Moang-ping-tsching-mai* (Tsching-mai or Zimmay) and that the *Pe-I* or Shans called them *Moang-Yung*. Now Moang-Yung (*Yun* or *Ywon*) is the Shan name for Zimmay, the former inhabitants of which place were in all probability Karens. (See Sir J. Bowring, *Siam* II., p. 43. *Pauthier's Marco Polo*, p. 424 *et seq* : Also, on Zimmay, &c., *Phayre*, in *J. A. S. B.* XXXVII. pt. I, p. 102; and *Buchanan-Hamilton*, *Edinburgh Phil. Journ.* II., p. 268.)

because with the varying fortunes of war they were frequently changed. The northern border is nowhere distinctly mentioned that I am aware of, but it was probably adjacent to the Mishmi country; the eastern is said to have been the Cambodia River, while the west and south, according to the Mung-Mau and Mogaung annals, were believed to be bounded by the nine arms of the sea*—beginning in the west on the borders of Bengal and extending to the east beyond the territory of the Ayudia Shans (Siam). If this were accepted, however, it would include the whole of Burmah and Siam in the Mau dominions, and this was never the case even in the most flourishing days of that kingdom and at the period of its greatest extension, as will be seen in the list of conquests further on. But in the meantime its approximate extent may be conveniently estimated by the chief *Maings*, or dependencies, embraced by it at ordinary times of its independence. These were (1) Mogaung; (2) Monyin; (3) Khamti; (4) Monei; (5) Theinni; (6) Kaingma; (7) Maing-Maing; (8) Maing-Lung; (9) Maing-Lem; (10) Kiang-Hung (K. Yung gyi or Cheili); (11) Kiang-Tung; (12) Mung-miet (Momiet), &c., &c.

With regard to the dates employed, as further on it will be necessary to compare some I have obtained with those given by former writers, and in some cases, also, to make very considerable alterations in hitherto accepted figures, it may be as well to explain, at once, upon what the dates throughout are based.

The Shans have no era, but like the Chinese, Cambodians and other allied races, count their time by means of cycles of 60 years formed of two parts curiously combined; the Chinese, who date their cycles to commence from so far back as 2637 B.C.,† being, for that reason, probably the originators of the system and the rest their disciples. In the Chinese scheme there are ten so-called "stems" and twelve "branches," the former being combined in couplets in order to form five multipliers to the latter, which are named after twelve ordinary animals. In the Cambodian, Laotian and Anamite schemes the twelve branches are

* Viz., the bays formed by the various peninsulas of the coast.

† Williams' "*Middle Kingdom*," vol. II, p. 148.

named, according to Garnier, after animals in the same way as the Chinese, though the animals are not all precisely the same, nor do they come in the same order. A comparative list would stand thus* :—

Chinese.	Laotian and Anamite.	Cambodian.	Siamese.
Rat.	Rat.	Ox.	Rat.
Cow (ox).	Ox.	Tiger.	Ox.
Tiger.	Tiger.	Hare.	Tiger.
Rabbit (hare).	Hare.	Dragon.	Hare.
Dragon.	Dragon.	Snake.	Great dragon.
Snake.	Snake.	Horse.	Little dragon.
Horse.	Horse.	Goat.	Horse.
Sheep (goat).	Goat.	Monkey.	Goat.
Monkey.	Monkey.	Cock.	Monkey.
Cock.	Cock.	Dog.	Cock.
Dog.	Dog.	Pig.	Dog.
Bear.	Pig.	Rat.	Pig.

But Garnier does not show in what way the twelve names are classified or multiplied in order to form a cycle with each of the 60 years bearing a separate name. Sir J. Bowring, however, speaks of the Siamese cycle as composed of a five-fold repetition of the twelve names arranged in decades, the first commencing with the *rat* and ending with the *cock*, the second beginning with the *dog* and ending with the *goat*, and so on regularly to the sixth decade. And this indeed is probably the way with the Laotians and Cambodians† and certainly with the Northern Shans as will be seen by the following table, where the ten branches, or classifiers, are arranged so as to multiply the twelve stems only five times and to supply the number of the year when the name (or *Lakli* as the Shans term it) is used, or *vice versa*, in regular order, as described by Sir John Bowring. It is noteworthy also that the names used for the animals are nearly entirely the Laotian names and not those of their own language :—

* See Williams as above. Garnier "*Voyage d'Exploration, &c.*" I., p. 93 and p. 466. Bowring's *Siam*, I., p. 156.

† Of the Anamites I cannot speak, but Garnier tells us (I., p. 466) that the Siamese have adopted the Cambodian system word for word, and I believe I have ascertained that the Laotian is precisely that of the Northern Shans.

Table for naming the years of the Shan cycle when the number is given, or numbering them when the name is given.

	Saw.	Plaw.	Ng.	Mau.	Si.	Siu.	Singa.	Mut.	San.	Raw.	Mit.	Kiu.
Kap	1		51		41		31		21		11	
Dap		2		52		42		32		22		12
Rai	13		3		53		43		33		23	
Mung		14		4		54		44		34		24
Plek	25		15		5		55		45		35	
Kat		26		16		6		56		46		36
Kbut	37		27		17		7		57		47	
Rung		38		28		18		8		58		48
Taw	49		39		29		19		9		59	
Kaa		50		40		30		20		10		60

The system is doubtless the same as the Indian cycle of 60 or the "Jovian cycle," though this is not arranged in *twelves* and *tens* but in a continuous list of sixty single appellations. Under the name of *Vrihaspati Chakra* this has been discussed and tabulated by Prinsep,* who is of opinion that its introduction into India is of comparatively recent date—or about the year 965 A.D., and though he points out what is obvious, that the small cycle of twelve—the so-called "branches" of the Chinese—is "in fact the true cycle of Jupiter," he gives no explanation of the origin of the ten "stems," or multipliers. In his comparative table, the first year of the Indian list corresponds with the fourth of the Chinese, and this Prinsep believes goes far to disprove the connection of the two systems; but it is curious that some Brahmin astrologers at Mandalay, who were applied to for an explanation of the above Shan scheme, at once connected it with the Indian cycle by producing the following table, or transfer of the Shan into the Hindoo cycle in every-day use in India. The

* *Indian Antiquities*, II—*Useful Tables*, pp. 159 *et seq.*

† One revolution of Jupiter is in reality only about 11 years and 10 months, or 4,332·585 days.

Sanscrit names (as transliterated for me) are, it may be observed, almost identical with those given by Prinsep:—

No.	Shan Name.	Hindoo Name.	No.	Shan Name.	Hindoo Name.
1	Kap-saw.	Prabhava.	31	Kap-singa.	Himalongba.
2	Dap-plaw.	Bibhava.	32	Dap-mut.	Bilongba.
3	Rai-ngi.	Sukla.	33	Rai-san.	Vikari.
4	Mung-mau.	Promudhat.	34	Mung-raw.	Sarbari.
5	Plek-si.	Projaputi.	35	Plek-mit.	Plava.
6	Kat-siu.	Angira.	36	Kat-kiu.	Subba-krita.
7	Khut-singa.	Srimukha.	37	Khut-saw.	Subhana.
8	Rung-mut.	Bhava.	38	Rung-plaw.	Krudhi.
9	Taw-san.	Juba.	39	Taw-ngi.	Bisvabasu.
10	Kaa-raw.	Dhatti.	40	Kaa-mau.	Porabhava.
11	Kap-mit.	Iswara.	41	Kap-si.	Plabanga.
12	Dap-kiu.	Bohudhanya.	42	Dap-siu.	Kiloka.
13	Rai-saw.	Promathi.	43	Rai-singa.	Saumya.
14	Mung-plaw.	Vikrama.	44	Mung-mut.	Sadharona.
15	Plek-ngi.	Brisha.	45	Plek-san.	Virudhi-krita.
16	Kat-mau.	Chitrabhanu.	46	Kat-rau.	Paridharbi.
17	Khut-si.	Subhanu.	47	Khut-mit.	Promarhi.
18	Rung-siu.	Tarona.	48	Rung-kiu.	Anangda.
19	Taw-singa.	Parthiba.	49	Taw-saw.	Rak-khyosa.
20	Kaa-mut.	Byaya.	50	Kaa-plaw.	Nala.
21	Kap-san.	Sarajit.	51	Kap-ngi.	Pingala.
22	Dap-raw.	Sarvadhari.	52	Dap-mau.	Kalyukta.
23	Rai-mit.	Virudhi.	53	Rai-si.	Sidharhi.
24	Mung-kiu.	Bikrita.	54	Mung-siu.	Rudra.
25	Plek-saw.	Khora.	55	Plek-singa.	Durmoti.
26	Kat-plaw.	Nongdona.	56	Kat-mut.	Dundubhi.
27	Khut-ngi.	Vijaya.	57	Khut-san.	Rudhirud-gari.
28	Rung-mau.	Jaya.	58	Rung-raw.	Raktak-kha.
29	Taw-si.	Munmutha.	59	Taw-mit.	Krudhana.
30	Kaa-siu.	Durmukha.	60	Kaa-kiu.	Akhyaya.

But from whatever the system is derived, it is obvious that if the number of a cycle (or *Tausinga* as the Shan word is) and the name (or *Lakli*) of any particular year were given, nothing would be more simple than to identify the date; but in the Shan books the cycle is ignored altogether, neither name nor number being recorded, and in consequence it is impossible to fix a date from their annals direct and without having recourse to ulterior facts as starting points.

The length of each king's reign, however, is carefully preserved, and indeed this forms the main basis on which to reckon the dates; also where an interval occurs between the death of one king and the accession of another, it is chronicled with every appearance of accuracy. But whether such appearances as these are to be relied upon is another matter, for in the first place it is quite possible that dates and facts have often been perverted to exalt the dignity of some particular prince, or to suit the convenience of the historian in surmounting obstacles connected with his story; and secondly, the dates in Burmese history, to which I have had to refer certain well-marked events, for the purpose of fixing the cycle, are themselves to a great extent untrustworthy. Sir Arthur Phayre* speaks generally of the uncertainty of the Burmese calendar, and points out that it has frequently been arbitrarily interfered with by various kings for superstitious or ambitious reasons; and Father Sangermano† solemnly warns his reader, before entering into his translations of the Burmese annals "not to flatter himself that he will receive accurate information, since the Burmese histories and traditions are filled with strange hyperbolical accounts and fabulous narratives;" while (at p. 40) he also speaks to the fact of the Burmese princes having, at various times, altered the calendar "to suit their prejudices or convenience." And at the same time that these remarks are, in all probability, equally applicable to the Shan histories, it might be added that the Shan kings frequently changed their own names in honor of some remarkable event, assumed the name of some ancestor, or were known by a surname; consequently the name itself is often a puzzle in addition to all other difficulties.‡

Some events, however, sufficiently well marked to constitute starting points, are to be found recorded in both Burmese and Shan annals, and in the case of one of them, even a reference to the Chinese calendar is possible, and as this latter shows only a difference of *three* years in the date as

* *Journ. As. Soc. Bengal*, 1868, vol. XXXVII., pt. I., p. 83.

† "*Description of Burmese Empire*," translated by W. Tandy. Rome, 1833, p. 36.

‡ In the tables of both the Mung-Mau and Asam lines, it should be remarked, there is an appearance of the Shan dates having been adopted to suit the local circumstances, for in both instances the table commences with *Kapsaw* or the year 1 of the cycle, and there is no reason why this should be the case unless by mere accident.

given by the Burmese record of the same event, the agreement is more than sufficient to prove the particular cycle to which it belongs. The event I refer to is the flight of Chau-Ngan-pha, a king of Mung-Mau, or Kusambi, to Ava after a battle with the Chinese near his capital on the Shueli. He was followed to Ava by his enemy, who demanded his rendition of the Burmese king, and as the latter was about to surrender the fugitive he poisoned himself, and his body was delivered to the Chinese Commander, who dried it in the sun and returned with it to Yunnan. Now this story is told, firstly in the Shan history of Mung-Mau,* where the date of Chan-Ngan-pha's death is placed in a certain year of a certain unnamed and unnumbered cycle; secondly, the Burmese annals chronicle the circumstance, and date the death of the Shan king in 807 of their era † or 1445 A.D.; while, thirdly, in Demaille's History of China‡ precisely the same event is recorded as having occurred in 1448 A.D.

This coincidence of two independent sets of annals would be sufficient, in itself, to fix the cycle for the Shan year named, and also to form a starting point from which to reckon the remainder of their dates. But other means are also available for the purpose of identifying events by comparing the chronicles of the Shans with those of their neighbours, one of which may be mentioned. According to the Mau and Mogaung histories, one Sam-lung-pha, brother of the then king of Mung-Mau and Commander-in-Chief of his forces, undertook the conquest of Upper Asam at a certain period of his brother's reign. Some four or five years subsequently a relative named Chau-ka-pha was established as first Tsaubwa or ruler of the newly-conquered territory. And we know from independent modern Asamese sources that the date of Chau-ka-pha's accession is 1229 A.D., and that it is probably correct, or nearly so to within a year or two. The event is not only one of the most conspicuous in the history of Mung-Mau and of its dependency Mogaung, but with the Asamese it holds a corresponding position to the Norman conquest in the history of England, and serves the purely

* See below.

† See Colonel Burney in J. A. S. B., 1837, vol. VI., p. 123. I have adopted the Burmese date in the following story and tables.

‡ Garnier, I., p. 481.

Ahom race in Asam as a starting point from which to date their entire history; for these people first migrated to that country at the time of Sam-lung-pha's invasion. Until the reign of king Gaurinath Sing (1780 to 1795), the Asamese annals had been very imperfectly kept, but that king caused a commission of Nora astronomers and other learned persons to be deputed to Mogaung to examine the histories of their race in possession of the Shan Buddhist priests of that place, and to verify the books (or traditions) brought into the country by Chau-ka-pha. The examination completed, this commission re-wrote the Ahom history, in Asamese, and extended it backwards from Sam-lung-pha's conquest of Asam to the founding of the first Shan capital on the Shueli river, and in doing so, happily made two statements, either of which, like the above story of Chau-Ngan-pha, would, in itself, be sufficient to identify a cycle as a starting point. The first statement is that they, the astronomers and others, having calculated the dates, &c., find that *eleven* Tausingas elapsed between the descent from heaven of the founders of the city on the Shueli to the accession of Chau-ka-pha as king of Upper Asam; the second is an incidental remark that the Burmese commenced their national era with the reign of the Mau king Ai-dyep-that-pha. Now if *eleven* Tausingas or 660 years be subtracted from the date 1229 A.D., the year of Chau-ka-pha's accession, we arrive at 569 A.D. or within *one* year of the date that would be shown by subtracting the aggregate of the reigns from the date of Chau-Ngan-pha's death; * while, again, the reign of Ai-dyep-that-pha is stated by the Shans to have commenced in the 70th year after the foundation of Mung-Ri Mung-Ram which would give (568+70), 638 A.D., or the year usually assumed for the commencement of the Burmese national era.

Thus, so far as the Burmese and other histories to which these isolated events have been referred are trustworthy, it would appear that a sufficient amount of agreement can be established to show that no material error is likely to have occurred in computing the dates of the following story, though, at the same time, absolute accuracy must not be looked for.

* I have assumed in the tables 568 A.D. as the date of the founding of Mung-Ri Mung-Ram, for so the original city—the Mongmaorong of Pemberton, as will be seen below—was called.

THE STORY OF MUNG-MAU.

THOUGH the Mau Shans trace their existence as a nation to the fabulous and comparatively recent source of the heaven-descended kings, Kun-Lung and Kun-Lai, as will be seen below, still as a race they appear, from the Burmese books, to have a legend assigning their origin to the earliest period of Burmese history, and indeed to a common parentage with the latter people. That this is not an original tradition of their race, but one imported in the course of Buddhist teachings, there can be little doubt; but it is remarkable that no other appears to exist, either in their own or Burmese writings. The legend is probably the one briefly referred to in the opening lines of Chap. II. of Yule's *Mission to Ava*, and of which the author justly remarks that it is one "of equal value and like invention to that which deduced the Romans from the migrations of the pious Æneas, the ancient Britons from Brut the Trojan and the Gael from Scots, daughter of Pharaoh."

However, as the story is not produced in any English writings that I am acquainted with, except in so far as it refers to the Burmese,* it may be worth while to give an epitome of it as derived from that section of the Burmese history known as the *Tagaung Raza Weng*.

About 300 years before the birth of Gaudama, or 923 B.C., and 1491 years before the descent of Kun-Lung and Kun-Lai, a Sakya prince called Abhi Raja arrived from Kapilavastu † by way of Aracan and founded the city of Pagan (called Thindue ‡ in some accounts) on the left bank of the Irawaddy. He had two sons, whose Burmese names were Kang-gyi and Kang-gei (elder and younger Kang), and at his death the former retired to Aracan and became king of that country, whilst Kang-gei succeeded his father at Pagan, and in his turn was succeeded by thirty-one of

* See Colonel Burney in *J. A. S. B.*, vol. V., p. 157 *et seq.*

† Or Kapilanagara, the birth place of the last Buddha identified by General Cunningham with Nagar on the Upper Manurama or Coocanee tributary of the Gogra. (*Ant. Geogr. of India*, p. 414 *et seq.*)

‡ Also Thantaya Myo.

his lineal descendants, whose names are given in the Burmese record, but no dates. The last of these, or the 33rd from Abhi Raja, was one Beinaka, who reigned, roughly speaking, about the commencement of the religious era, or partly during Gaudama's lifetime. In the course of Beinaka's reign a Chinese * army invaded his country, captured Pagan, destroyed it, and obliged him to take refuge at Malei on the right bank of the Irawaddy and nearly opposite the present ruins of lower Tsampanago.† Here he shortly afterwards died, and his people became broken up into three divisions. One of these remained at Malei under Beinaka's queen, Naga Seing, a second wandered towards the south and was absorbed by the Piu, a section of the Burmese proper, while the third migrated eastward and became Shans, forming the nineteen original Shan districts or states.

Of these districts or states no names are given, and probably the number is an imaginative one; but it is remarkable that the legend of the Pwons, derived from an entirely different and original source, carries us back to this same event—the first fall of old Pagan. These people pretend that they are descendants of the elephant drivers whom the Chinese conquerors pressed into their service to conduct the elephants captured in the city back to China; that they escaped thence, and wandered westward to the third defile (Kyaukdwen) of the Irawaddy where they are still settled.‡

After the Chinese had retired from Pagan, one Dhaja Raja, another prince of Kapilavastu, came from India, married the widow Naga Seing, and rebuilt the capital immediately beyond the north wall of the old city. This was

* Mr. Mason ("Burma," p. 37) says "the people who destroyed Tagaang came from Kandahar, the modern Candahar, and were, therefore, the Khandarin of the Greeks," but as we know the Buddhistical name applied to China is Gandala (a form of Caudahar), and as the name used in the Burmese text of this legend is frequently "Tarouk Gandala Rit," there can be no doubt that China is meant.

In Colonel Burney's translation, above quoted, he says "the Chinese and Tartars came from the country of *Tsein*, in the Empire of *Gandalareet*."

† Champa-nagara (?).

‡ The Pwons, I am informed, do not speak the Tai language, but it is said that they write it, their own language never having been reduced to writing. They are closely allied to the Kadus on the borders of Munnipur both in language and customs, and are probably of one origin with the latter, whether the above tradition be true or not.

the Tagaung* of the Burmese and the Tai-Tung-Kung of the Shans, and the date of its foundation given by the Burmese is the 20th year of the Rel. Era, (523 B.C.), and by the Shans the 24th year (519 B.C.). After this there are no dates, or numbers of generations, recorded with any certainty, but Dhaja Raja's dynasty appears to have ruled at Tagaung until Kun-Lung displaced it and put his son, Ai-Kun-Lung, on the throne at some date probably within one generation posterior to the year 568 A.D. (see Table "Kun-Lung's posterity") if, indeed, it occurred at all.

It is, however, with the Mau Shans rather than with Tagaung that we are concerned, so let us pass on at once to their earliest national legend, which is told in all the Shan histories with, apparently, little variation, thus:—

In the year of Religion 1111 or 568 A.D., two sons of the gods, named Kun-Lung and Kun-Lai, descended from heaven by a golden ladder and alighted in the valley of the Shueli River. They were accompanied by two ministers, Kun-Tun and Kun-Bun, one of whom was descended from the sun and the other from the moon; they were also attended by an astrologer descended from the family of Jupiter, and by a number of other mythical personages. On arriving at earth they found men who immediately submitted to them as rulers sent from the gods, while one of the mortals called Laun-gu or Chau-Ti-Kan offered to become the servant of the two brothers. Before leaving heaven, the god Tenkam† had given them a cock and a knife and had enjoined them, immediately on arriving at earth, to kill the cock with the knife and to offer up prayers to him at the same time; when the ceremony was over, they were to eat the head of the bird themselves and give the body to their ministers and attendants. It was found, however, that by some mistake the cock and the knife had been left behind and Laun-gu was sent to heaven to bring them down. He went and returned with both, but reported that the god Tenkam

* In Colonel Burney's text (*J. A. S. B.*, vol. V., p. 163) the older city is called *Tagaung*, and the one rebuilt by Dhaja Raja, *Pagan* or *Pinjala-rit* or *Pinja Tagaung*. Dr. C. Williams visited the ruins in 1863 and made plans of the walls (partly from inspection and partly from the information of the local officials), which will be found in the 33rd vol. of the *J. A. S. B.*, p. 194.

† Regarded by the Shans as the son of Indra. See *Garnier* (p. 473, vol. I.) where *Phya Then* is spoken of as the Laos god who created heaven and earth.

being angry with the brothers for their carelessness in leaving these things behind, had sent a message that after duly sacrificing the cock, the brothers were to eat a portion of the body only and give the rest to their attendants. In this way Laun-gu managed to secure for himself the head. He then asked the brothers to confer upon him some reward for the service he had rendered in regaining the sacrificial objects from heaven, and they gave him the country of Mithila* to govern. Having eaten the head of the cock he became a wise and powerful Chinese ruler, while the heaven-descended brothers, only having eaten of the body, remained ignorant Mau Shans.

Laun-gu, on arriving in Mithila, founded the capital Mung-Kyei and commenced his rule in 568 A.D. He died after 60 years' reign in 628, and was succeeded by his son Chau-Pa, who also reigned 60 years, and was followed in his turn by his son Sek-Ka in 688†. This last, with his lineal descendants, it is stated, ruled for two hundred years when a relation (of the same race) named Fwei-No-Ngan-Maing succeeded to the throne, and, together with his descendants, retained it for 150 years or to A.D. 1038. Further than this the Shan records do not follow Laun-gu *alias* Chau-Ti-Kan.

Shortly after their descent to earth Kun-Lung and Kun-Lai quarrelled on the subject of precedence, and the former determined to abandon his claim to the kingdom in the Shueli valley and to found a new one for himself. With this view he packed the two images of his ancestors, one male, called Sung and one female, called Seng, into a box‡ and

* The Pali or classical name for Mung Kyei or Mung Chei, which properly speaking is the Shan name for *China* generally, but in reality Yunnan only, is meant. Garnier mentions *M. Tché* as the Shan name for Yunnan (l. p. 474), and the Chinese as a people are known to the Shans as Kyei or Chei. (See also *Yule's Ava*, p. 308, *Dr. Anderson*, "*Expedition to Yunnan*," p. 4, and *Ritter, Erdkunde Von Asien*, IV. p. 765.) On Colonel Yule's map of Burma, 1855, the classical name for Yunnan is given as *Widharit*; this, however, implies Mithila, for Videha or Vaideha was but another name for the ancient Mithila (see *Cunningham, Anct. Geogr. India*, p. 444. Also *Wilson's Sanscrit Dictionary*).

† Can this be the original tradition of Nanchao? The term 60 years so often used in these half mythical writing is, I suspect, merely a way of indicating roughly a considerable length of time and means about one cycle.

‡ This box, still containing one of the idols, is said to have been in the possession of the Asamese prince Purundur Sing when he took refuge in Bengal in 1818.

started towards the west, carrying the box upon his head. He crossed the Irawaddy and shortly afterwards arrived at a place near the Uru (Ooroo) tributary of the Kyendwen, where he established himself and founded a city called Maing-Kaing Maing-nyaung,* and whence he sent forth his sons, or relations, to become rulers of neighbouring states. Of these there appear to have been seven, but whether sons or not is uncertain; however, it is of little importance, as from the following list it will be seen that this part of the record has hardly yet emerged from the domain of fable:—

Distribution of Kun-Lung's posterity (i.e., his seven sons or descendants).

1. Aing Kun-Lung King of Tai-tung-kung or Tagaung.
2. Kun-pha King of Mo-nyin (Mung-nyaung). He was appointed in consideration of paying Kun-Lung a yearly tribute of ten lakhs of horses. (A large number of horses is probably meant).
3. Kun-Ngu... .. King of Lamung-Tai; i.e., Labun near Zimmei in Siam. Yearly tribute, 300 elephants.
4. Kun-Kwot-pha King of Yun-lung or Mung Yong (probably Garnier's M. Yong, I., p. 473). He was the origin of the Taipong race of Maus. Yearly tribute, a quantity of gold.
5. Kun-La King of Mung-Kula or Kalei on a west tributary of the Kyendwen. Tribute, water from the Kyendwen.
6. Kun-Tha King of Ava—*sic*, but probably Momiet is meant, especially as a ruby mine is said to have existed at his capital. Tribute, two *riss* (about 7 lbs.) of rubies yearly.
7. Kun-Su King of modern Mung-nyaung on or near the Uru tributary of the Kyendwen, at which place his father (Kun-Lung) had also reigned.

Kun-Su reigned for 25 years, *viz.*, from 608 to 633 A.D.

Chau-Sên-Sau (a son) 19 " " " 633 to 652 "

Chau-Kun-jau " 15 " " " 652 to 667 "

Chau-Kun-jun " 11 " " " 667 to 678 "

During the reign of this last, his son Kham-pong-pha went to reside at Mung-Ri Mung-Ram, and afterwards reigned there as King of Mung-Mau. (See No. 3 of Mung-Mau Table, p. 26 below.)

Thus Kun-Lung and his posterity reigned at M. Kaing M. Nyaung for 110 years, and meanwhile Kun-Lai had founded a capital called Mung-Ri Mung-Ram at a short distance

* Sometimes called Mung-Kung, but must not be confounded with Mogaung (M. Kaung). The position is difficult to define exactly. There is said to be a modern town of M. Nyaung on a small left tributary of the Kyendwen below the Uru, but above the town of Kendat, and another called Maing-Kaing on the left bank of the Uru. The whole district is perhaps meant.

from the left bank of the Shueli, and supposed to be some eight or nine miles to the eastward of the present city of Mung-Mau. Here he reigned for 70 years, and was succeeded by his son Ai-dyep-that-pha, who ruled for 40 years, but who died without issue in 678 A.D.,* and consequently in the fortieth year of the Burmese era. The son of Chau-Kun-Jun, mentioned in the above list, was then created king, and in his person Kun-Lung's line became supreme among the Mau. The length of his reign is not known, but he was followed by his son, during whose rule the capital M. Ri. M. Ram declined, and became of secondary importance to the town of Ma-Kau Mung-Lung (or Ka-Kao-Mung Lung),† which was situated on the right bank of the river and believed to be some six or seven miles west of the capital. This king was succeeded by his younger brother, Kam-Sip-pha, who ascended the throne in 703 A.D. and established his court at Ma-Kau Mung-Lung, thus finally abandoning Mung-Ri Mung-Ram.

During the next 332 years Kam-Sip-pha and his descendants appear to have reigned in regular succession, while nothing worth recording is to be found during the whole of this period. The succession, however, was broken at the death of Chau-Lip-pha in 1035, and a relation of the race of Taipong of Yun Lung‡ was placed on the throne in that year. He was called Kun-Kwot-pha§ and signalled the change in the succession by establishing a new capital, called Cheila, on the left bank of the Shueli and immediately opposite Ma-Kau Mung-Lung. He is also said to have incorporated Bamo with his dominions.

At this period the dominant power in all these regions was that of the king of New Pagan, Anauratha, and in the

* See table, pp. 26 & 27 for all the Mau kings to follow.

† See Hannay (*Sketch of Singphos, &c.*, 1847, p. 54) where the name of Kai Khao Mau Loung, *the great and splendid city*, is given as the capital of the Pong Kingdom on the Shueli. The word *Mau* is significant, though my informants make it "Mung." At p. 55 Hannay gives *Moong Khao Loung* as the old name for the present Mogaung; in both these names *Khao* probably means *city*.

‡ See list of Kun-Lung's posterity No. 4., p. 15.

§ It may be remarked here that the word *Kun* means King, and is nearly equivalent to *Chau Pha* or *Tsaubwa*; thus *Chau Lip Pha*, or King Lip, the middle syllable being the name, the others the royal title. In modern English documents relating to Siam it is generally written *Chow-fa* or *Chau-Phya* (e.g., in *Ditchison's Treaties*, vol. I., p. 324, &c.)

history of M. Mau it is recorded that Kun-Kwot-pha's son and successor gave his daughter in marriage to the Pagan monarch, thus almost implying that he acknowledged him as liege lord, though it is also stated that he never went to the Pagan court, as a true vassal must have done.* But however this may have been during Anauratha's lifetime, certainly the succeeding kings of Mau were entirely independent, and they appear to have reigned in peace and unbroken succession until the death of Pam-Yau-Pung in A.D. 1210, when a third influx of Kun-Lung's posterity occurred in the person of Chau-Ai-Mo-Kam-Neng, of the race of Kun-Su of Maing-Kaing Maing-Nyaung. And it is remarkable that this new influx took place while Pam-Yau-Pung's younger brother was actually in power in the neighbouring state of Momiet, where he had just previously founded the capital and commenced an almost independent reign, as will be seen in the note on Momiet and Asam.

Chau-Ai-Mo-Kam-Neng reigned for ten years and had two sons, Chau-Kwam-pha (or Chau-Kam-pha, the Soo-Kam-pha of Pemberton) and Sam-Lung-Kun-Maing (or Sam-Lung-pha), the latter perhaps the most remarkable personage in the Mau history. The first succeeded to the throne of Mung-Mau at the death of his father in 1220 A.D., but Sam-Lung-pha had already, five years previously, become Tsaubwa of Mung-Kaung or Mogaung, where he had established a city on the banks of the Nam Kaung† and had laid the foundation of a new line of tsaubwas, tributary only to the kings of Mau. He appears to have been essentially a soldier and to have undertaken a series of campaigns under his brother's direction or perhaps as Commander-in-Chief of his army.‡ The first of these campaigns began by an expedition

* Sir Arthur Phayre, in his translation of the *Maha-Radza-Weng*, says of King Anauratha during his return journey from China: "While passing through Shan, a Chinese Province of Mau, he married Tsau-Nwun-hla, the daughter of the Prince of the Province." (*J.A.S.B.*, XXXVII, pt. I, No. II, 1863, p. 94). At p. 107 also, he remarks that Anauratha is represented as having married a daughter of the king of Weithali, but rightly observes that the ancient kingdom of Weithali (Weisali), situated to the north of the present Patna, could scarcely have been in existence at this time. But the adopted Buddhistical name of Asam was (and is to the present day) Weisali; thus the lady whom Anauratha married may have been an Asamese (i.e., Kamrup) princess of the then reigning dynasty.

† See note on Mogaung.

‡ The number of Sam-Lung-pha's army is not given, but when the whole was assembled it was tallied by each man dropping one Yuei seed (Abrus precatorius) into a basket, when $3\frac{1}{2}$ baskets were filled.

into Mithila when he conquered Maing-ti (Nan-tien), Momien and Wan Chang (Yung Chang) and from thence extended his operations towards the south, Kaingma, Maing-Maing, Kiang-Hung, Kaing-Tung and other smaller states, each in turn falling under the Mau yoke. With Theinni an amicable arrangement was come to, in virtue of which the tsaubwa of that state became so far a vassal as to engage to send a princess, periodically, to the harem of the Mau king.

Immediately on Sam-Lung-pha's return to Mung-Mau he was ordered away on a second expedition to the west, and on this occasion crossed the Kyendwen river and overran a great portion of Aracan, laying the capital in ruins, and establishing his brother's supremacy in a number of towns on, and beyond, the right bank of the Kyendwen.

A third expedition was then undertaken to Munnipur with similar success to the two last, and again a fourth to Upper Asam, where he conquered the greater portion of the territory then under the sway of the Chutya or Sutya kings.*

While on his return from this expedition Chau-Kwam-pha being jealous or fearful of his brother's influence decided to put him to death, and with this end in view left his capital on the Shueli and proceeded to meet him at Maing-pet-Kham† on the Tapeng river. A great ovation was given to the successful general, but after the lapse of some time, according to the most trustworthy account, his brother succeeded in poisoning him, or, according to another account, he failed in the attempt, and Sam-Lung-pha made good his escape to China.

This was probably the period of greatest extension reached by the Mau kingdom, and certainly if their own account be accepted, their country now formed a very respectable dominion. The following is the list given by the Shan historians of the states under the sovereignty of the Mau kings immediately subsequent to Sam-Lung-pha's conquests, but a mere glance at the names of some of them, such as Aracan, Tali, &c., will show it to be greatly exaggerated, though it is

* See separate note on the Sutya, p. 61.

† Probably Hentha, sometimes called *Shue Hentha-myo* near old Bamo, which is the exact meaning of the Shan words *Kham-pet-maing*, viz., golden-duck town.

possible that at one time or another some portion of all the places named may have fallen under their power:—

1. Momiet, comprising seven maings, *viz.*, Bhamo Molai,* Maing-lung, Ungbaung, Thibo, Thungzei, Singu, Tagaung.

2. Mogaung comprising ninety-nine maings, among which the following were the most important: Mung-lung (Asam); Kassei (Munnipur); part of Aracan; the Yaw country; Kalei; Taungthwot (Sumjok); Maing-Kaing; Maing-Yaung; Maing-Kwon; Sankring Khamti†; Maingli (Khamti proper); Monyin; Mautshobo; Kunung-Kumun (Mishmi country); Khang-sei (Naga country); &c., &c.

3. Theinni, comprising thirty-nine‡ maings.

4. Monei.

5. Kaingma.

6. Kyain Sen (Kiang-Tsen on the Cambodia?)

7. Lansan (Linzin).

8. Pagan.

9. Yun (Zimmei).

10. King-lung (said to be Kiang Hung, Kiang-Yung-gyi or Cheili).

11. King-laung (said to be a district north of Ayudia).

12. Mung Lem.

13. Tai-lai (Tali-fu?)

14. Wanchang (Yung-chang-fu).

15. The Palaung country (Taungbain, &c).

16. Sang-pho (the Singpho country?)

17. The Karen country.

18. Lawaik.

19. Lapyit.

20. Lamu (?)

21. Lakhaing (Aracan—meaning probably that portion not under Mogaung).

22. Langsap (?)

23. Ayudia (Siam).

24. Tawi (Tavoy.)

25. Yunsaleng.

* Said to lie south-east of Bamo, and probably near the present Nam-Kam.

† Sometimes known as Kham Nyang.

‡ Sometimes called the *forty-nine* maings.

During the two reigns following that of Chau-Kwam-pha, the capital of Mung-Mau remained at Cheila or at the opposite town of Ma-Kau Mung-Lung, but in 1285 one Chau-Wak-pha became king, and though, apparently of unbroken lineal descent, a new capital was founded called simply by the name of the country, Mung-Mau, and situated, as far as can be ascertained, on the site of the present town of Mung-Mau—certainly this is the last change of capital recorded.

Chau-Wak-pha died after a reign of thirty years in 1315, and for nine years subsequently the throne of Mung-Mau was vacant. Eventually, however, a natural son named Ai-Puk was elected to fill it, but he proved profligate and incompetent to discharge the duties of a ruler, and after six years was deposed by the ministers, when a second period of nine years ensued, during which no king could be found to assume the direction of affairs.

Eventually in 1339 a relative of Chau-Wak-pha named Chau-Ki-pha, otherwise known as Tai-Pong, was crowned, and with him an era of wars with China appears to have commenced, which was destined, finally, to end in the fall of the Mau kings as independent sovereigns.

The first record of Chinese invasion is an unimportant one, and merely states that in the fifth year of Chau-Ki-pha's reign (Lakli Plek-Singa, 55=705 B.E.=1343 A.D.) an army arrived in Mau territory from Mithila for the purpose of reconnoitring, but that no fighting ensued. The next occasion was just fifty years subsequently, during the reign of Chau-Ki-pha's son Tailung, when a Chinese force appeared and attempted the conquest of the country; it was defeated, however, by the Shans and returned after suffering great losses.

Tailung, after a reign of fifty years, was succeeded by his son Chau-Tit-Pha, or Tau-Lwei, as he was also called, who appears to have carried on certain negotiations with the Chinese during the early part of his reign, and in the 16th year of it (Rai-ngi 3=773 B.E.=1411 A.D.) to have gone on a visit to the governor of Yunnan. The Shan history indeed chronicles that he went to Mung-Kyei, the capital of Mithila, to consult with the *Emperor*, and

that during an interview with the latter, in which he was accompanied by his son Chau-Ngan-Pha, he was given a cup of spirit to drink, which so completely intoxicated him that the Emperor, at the instigation of a Minister named Maw-pi, obtained from him his royal seal and thus rendered his country tributary.* In Plek-si 5, or two years after this event, Chau-Tit-Pha returned to Mung-Mau, and in the next year a party of Chinese with 130 mules came down from China. Each mule was loaded with silver cut into small pieces, and on arriving in the neighbourhood of the capital, those in charge led them into the bamboo jungle that surrounded the city, and scattered the silver among the trees. The party then returned to China, and the inhabitants of Mung-Mau cut down the jungle in order to find the silver. The sequel of this story is not given, but the inference is that the ruse was practised by the Chinese to clear the environs of the city of the jungle in order to attack it the more easily.

In the following year Chau-Tit-Pha died and was succeeded by his son Chau-Ngan-Pha, the events attending the latter part of whose reign are well known from Burmese history. He had two brothers named Chau-Si-Pha,† and Chau-Hung-Pha, with whose assistance he invaded and subdued the Shan states to the east and south-east of his country, and then marched on to *Tai-lai*, which state he also conquered. Here he was reinforced by the armies of all the chiefs he had subdued so far, and decided, with this enormous host,‡ to attempt the conquest of Mithila. He started accordingly from *Tai-lai*, but was met by a Chinese force under the walls of the capital (Mung-kyei) and was defeated; he then fell back first on *Tai-lai*,§ afterwards on *Wan-Chang* (Yung-chang), and eventually retired into *Mau* territory, followed by the inhabitants of all the places he had

* We have already seen that the capital of Mithila is Yunnan-foo, and here the minister's name, according to the Shan record, is Maw-pi, so that possibly it may have been he who, as governor of Mithila, was visited by Chau-Tit-pha, and not the Emperor, whose residence was at that time at Nan-King, and whose reign was known as that of Cheng-tsu-Wen-ti. (See *Pauthier, Chine Moderne*, I, p. 488).

† See Table of Mogaung line, No. 10.

‡ This force tallied in the same way as Sam-Lung-pha's army (p. 17 above) is said to have been represented by four baskets of *yuei* seeds.

§ This *Tai-lai* would certainly appear to be *Tali-foo*, though Garnier gives the Shan name of the latter as "Mung-Koue" (Vol. I, p. 479.)

subdued, who preferred to cast in their lot with his, rather than endure the vengeance of the Chinese. On arriving near his capital, he found the inhabitants panic stricken and flying to Ayudia and in many other directions; his army broke up and joined in the flight, whilst he himself, accompanied by his brother Chau-Si-Pha, (Chau-Hung-Pha had died just previously) sought an asylum at Ava. The Chinese followed however, took up a position north of the city of Ava and demanded the surrender of Chau-Ngan-Pha from the Burmese king. The latter replied that one of his nobles called Ming-gei-kyo-dwen was in rebellion at Zei-mei-thin (Yemethen near Enlay), and that if the Chinese commander would first subdue and bring this rebellious noble to the capital, he would deliver to him the Mau king. The Chinese general consented and despatched a portion of his army to Zei-mei-thin. The place was surrounded, and Ming-gei-kyo-dwen captured and brought into Ava, but on hearing of his arrival Chau-Ngan-Pha finding his end inevitable took poison and died. His body nevertheless was given up to the Chinese commander, who had it disemboweled and dried in the sun, and immediately afterwards returned with it to Yunnan (B.E. 807 or 1445 A.D.).

Chau-Si-Pha was then placed on the throne of Mogaung, and Chau-Ngan-Pha's queen went at the same time to Khamti with her two children, Chau-Hung II., aged 10, and Chau Hup, aged 2; on arrival there a third, named Chau Put, was born, and one of these three became Tsaubwa of Khamti.*

For three years after Chau-Ngan-Pha's death, Mung-Mau was again without a king, but at the end of that time an uncle† of the late Chau-Wak-Pha, called Chau-Lam-Kon Kam-Pha, and nearest remaining relative to Chau-Ngan-Pha, was placed on the throne (Rai-saw 40=1448). In the fourth year of his reign a large force from China invaded his country, defeated his troops, and compelled him to take flight or seek a refuge with the Burmese at Ava. After five years' of exile he returned to his country and died in Rai-si 53=1461 A.D. He was succeeded in the same year by his son Chau-Hum-Pha, who was assailed almost immediately on his accession by a Chinese

* See note on Mogaung under "Chau-Kaa-Pha."

† Probably a descendant of an uncle is meant.

army of great strength, which however he defeated and drove back within the border of their country after eighteen days' of continued fighting. But at a later period of his reign (*viz.*, about 841 B.E.=1479 A.D.) the Chinese returned and this time routed the Maus, Chau-Hum-Pha, like his predecessor, flying to Ava for protection. After four years he returned to his capital, and seven years later died there. His death however did not terminate the wars with China, for in the sixth year of the reign of his son and successor, Chau-Kaa-Pha, (1495 A.D.) the enemy again came down in force and invaded the Mau territory. Some fighting occurred of which no particulars are given further than it proved adverse to the Shans, though not absolutely disastrous, but still sufficiently humiliating to the pride of Chau-Kaa-Pha to cause him to abdicate and make over the government to his son, Chau-Pim-Pha, while he himself retired to Ai-Kham, the northern division of Khamti, and afterwards to Mogaung, of which state he became Tsaubwa.

Chau-Pim-Pha appears to have been permitted by the Chinese to remain in peace for twenty years, when a force from Yunnan under a general named Li-Sang-Fa attempted an invasion of the country, but was repulsed. Li-Sang-Fa, however, only retired to a short distance within his own border, and shortly afterwards conceived the idea of taking Mung-Mau by means of a ruse. He constructed a number of rafts, placed a goat on each, and set them floating down the Shueli; the Shans on seeing the goats approaching from the side of China exclaimed "*Kyei-poi-pei-ma*"—the *Chinese goats* are coming floating down—a cry that quickly spread through the town as "*the Chinese* are coming floating down," and caused a general panic. The citizens, together with the army, fled in all directions, and Chau-Pim-Pha,* who was ill at the time and unable to move, died as the enemy entered his city.

The causes of these wars are never mentioned, and it is almost impossible to believe that the Chinese were always the aggressors, unless some provocation had been previously given by the Shans; still the next and last two Chinese wars are described by the Shan chroniclers, to be, like all

* He was surnamed *Kyei-poi-pei-ma* on account of the above episode.

the previous ones, purely unprovoked movements on the part of the enemy,—before these took place however the Maus were destined to experience what I believe was their first and only war with the Burmese.*

Chau-Pim-Pha was followed in 1516 by his son Chau-Hum-Pha II, who reigned for the extraordinary period of 88 years, and administered his country so successfully that it enjoyed a state of prosperity it had never before attained. Whether it was that this condition of prosperity excited the cupidity of the Pegu king, or whether he attacked Mung-Mau in the course of a general plan of conquest of the Shan states, it is impossible to say, but probably some cause other than that assigned by the Burmese chroniclers† is to be looked for. These pretend that shortly before 1560 the Maus had seized some villages within the borders of Momiet, and that the tsaubwa of the latter place had appealed to the Burmese for aid, but as Mómiet had up to within a year or two of this time been a part of the dominion of the Mau kings, and the Burmese had been steadily advancing their conquest of the Shan states from south to north, it is scarcely necessary to look for any special cause for quarrel. In any case, during the year 924 B.E.=1562 A.D., the king of Pegu is reported to have sent an army to Mung-Mau, numbering 200,000 men, under the command of his son, the heir-apparent, and three of his younger brothers, rulers respectively of Prome, Tongu, and Ava. They appear to have commenced the campaign with an incursion into the northern tsaubwaships and to have burned Sanda, Maing-La, and other neighbouring towns, and afterwards to have descended on the capital, where after little or no fighting they compelled Chau-Hum-Pha to acknowledge himself a vassal of the Pegu king, and to send him a princess in token of homage. When the Burmese army retired the city was spared, and teachers of Buddhism were left there to instruct the Shan priests in the worship of Gaudama and to convert the rulers and people.

* There had previously been several wars between the Burmese and dependent portions of the Mau country, chiefly Monyin which, from its position, was perhaps more accessible than other parts, to the Burmese.

† See the Burmese account translated by Colonel Burney (*J.A.S.B.*, VI., p. 125) where however the date is placed about two years later.

Some twenty years after these events (*viz.*, in Mung-siu 54=944 B.E.=1582 A.D.), and apparently during a time of peace between China and Burmah, the Maus were again attacked by a Chinese army numbered, in the usual inflated style, at 300,000 men. Three great battles were fought, none of which were decisively in favour of either party, but eventually the Chinese sued for peace, and when accorded by Chau-Hum-Pha, their army retired to Yunnan. Another twenty years of tranquillity then ensued, but in Kat-mau 16=966 B.E.=1604 A.D., a Chinese general named Wang-sang-su with a considerable force made a descent on the borders of Mung-Mau, and Chau-Hum-Pha being old and feeble decided to make over the government of his country to his son Chau-Po-Reing, then the reigning tsaubwa of Theinni. He had scarcely done so when he died, and at the same time the Chinese army commenced its march on the capital. The Shans appear to have made but a feeble resistance, if indeed any at all, for Chau-Po-Reing, a few days after his accession to the throne, abdicated and fled on the Chinese being reported to have arrived at the crossing of a certain tributary of the Shweli, a few miles above the capital. He made for Mogaung with a party of Chinese pursuing him, and reached Kakyo-Wainmaw, on the left bank of the Namkiu (Irawaddy), where his followers mutinied, and in despair he drowned himself in the river. The Kakyo-Wainmaw pawmaing recovered his body and buried it, subdued the mutinous followers, and sent them to Ava where they petitioned the king to grant the grandson, and only remaining descendant, of Chau-Hum-pha, a territory to reign over, as Mung-Mau was now in the permanent possession of the Chinese. This prince was called Chau-Ti-Pa, and he was relegated to Mogaung, where a certain line of tsaubwas had just then become extinct (see under Mogaung).

Table of Mung-Mau Tsaubwas.

Number.	NAME.	Relationship to the preceding.	COMMENCEMENT OF REIGN.				Capital.	REMARKS.
			Name of Shan year or Lakh.	Burmese era.	A.D.	Length of reign, years.		
1	Kun-lai	Kap-saw ... 1	*	568	70	Mung-Ri-Mung-Ram.	* Religious era 1111 or 70 years previous to Burmese era.
2	Ai-Dyep-That-pha ...	Son ...	Kaa-raw ... 10	1	638	40	Do. ...	Religious era 1181. Died heirless.
3	Kam-Pong-pha	Kaa-plaw ... 60	40†	678	†	Do. ...	† Sic. Son of Chau-Kun-Jun (see list of Kunlung's posterity, p. 15).
4	Kam-Sap-pha ...	Son	†	Do. ...	† The reigns of Nos. 3 and 4 are said to have aggregated about 25 years, but no date is given for No. 4.
5	Kam-Sip-pha ...	Younger brother.	Plek-ngi ... 15	65	703	50	Ma-Kau-Mung-Lung.	
6	Ni-Pa-maung ...	Son ...	Plek-si ... 5	115	753	40	Do.	
7	Chau-Khun-pha ...	Do. ...	Plek-san ... 45	155	793	41	Do.	
8	Chau-Kai-pha ...	Do. ...	Kat-plaw ... 26	196	834	34	Do.	
9	Chau-Han-pha ...	Do. ...	Kaa-kiu ... 60	230	868	33	Do.	
10	Chau-Tau-pha ...	Do. ...	Rai-san ... 33	263	901	32	Do.	
11	Chau-Pwot-pha ...	Do. ...	Plek-si ... 5	295	933	27	Do.	
12	Chau-Won-pha ...	Do. ...	Dap-mut ... 32	322	960	23	Do.	
13	Chau-Hon-pha ...	Do. ...	Plek-singa ... 55	345	993	12	Do.	
14	Chau-Han-pha ...	Do. ...	Khut-singa ... 7	357	995	19	Do.	
15	Chau-Lip-pha ...	Do. ...	Kat-plaw ... 26	376	1014§	21	Do. ...	§ This date is uncertain to about three years.
16	Khun-Kwot-pha ...	Relation.	Khut-mit ... 47	397	1035	15	Cheila ...	Of the race of Tai-pong of Yun-lung (see Kunlung's posterity, p. 15)
17	Chau-Tai-pha ...	Son ...	Dap-plaw ... 2	412	1050	12	Ma-Kau-Mung-Lung, and or Cheila.	
18	Chau-Lu-lu ...	Do. ...	Mung-plaw 14	424	1062	19	Do.	
19	Chau-Sang-mwun ...	Do. ...	Rai-san ... 33	443	1081	15	Do.	
20	Chau-Sang-yaw ...	Do. ...	Rung-kiu ... 48	458	1096	7	Do.	
21	Chau-Tai-pha ...	Younger brother.	Plek-singa ... 55	465	1103	9	Do.	
22	Chau-Shen-Nga ...	Son ...	Mung-mau. 4	474	1112	11	Do.	
23	Chau-Lu-Chu ...	Younger brother.	Plek-ngi ... 15	465	1123	14	Do.	
24	Chau-Nga-Chu ...	Do. ...	Taw-si ... 29	499	1137	8	Do.	
25	Chau-Khun-ming ...	Son ...	Khut-saw ... 37	607	1145	18	Do.	
26	Chau-Khun-Kum ...	Do. ...	Plek-singa ... 55	525	1163	8	Do.	
27	Chau-Tai-Pum ...	Do. ...	Rai-ngi ... 3	533	1171	17	Do.	
28	Chau-Tai-Lung ...	Do. ...	Kaa-mut ... 20	550	1188	15	Do.	

Table of Mung-Mau-Tsaubwas.—(Concluded.)

Number.	NAME.	Relationship to the preceding.	COMMENCEMENT OF REIGN.				Capital.	REMARKS.
			Name of Shan year or Laki.	Burmese era.	A. D.	Length of reign, years.		
29	Pam-Yau-Pung ...	Son ...	Plek-mit ... 35	565	1203	7	Ma-Kau-Mung-Lung, and or Cheila.	His younger brother, Fu-Sang-Kang, became Tsaubwa of Momiet and founded the Asam line of Tsaubwas. A descendant of K'wun-Su of Maing-Nyaung (see No. 7 K'unlung's posterity, p. 15). The Soo-Kam-Pha of Pemberton. His younger brother was Sam-Lung-Kung-Maing or Sam-Lung-Pha, the conqueror.
30	Chau-Ai-Mo-Kang-Neng.	Relation.	Dap-siu ... 42	572	1210	10	Do. ...	
31	Chau-Kwam-pha ...	Son ...	Dap-mau ... 52	582	1220	30	Do. ...	
32	Chau-Pin-pha ...	Do. ...	Dap-raw ... 22	612	1250	32	Do.	
33	Tai-Peng or Chau-Kam-pha.	Do. ...	Mung-siu ... 54	644	1282	3	Do.	Probably the founder of the present town of Mung-Mau.
34	Chau-Wak-pha ...	Do. ...	Khut-san ... 57	647	1285	30	Mung-Mau.	
	No King	Khut-ngi ... 27	677	1315	9	Do.	
35	Ai-Puk ...	Son of 34	Kat-kiu ... 36	656	1324	6	Do.	
	No King	Dap-siu ... 42	692	1330	9	Do.	
36	Chau-Ki-pha or Tai-Pong.	Relation.	Kap-ngi ... 51	701	1339	7	Do.	
37	Tai-Lung ...	Son ...	Rung-raw ... 53	708	1346	50	Do.	
38	Tau-Lwei or Chau-Tit-pha.	Do. ...	Rung-kiu ... 48	759	1396	19	Do.	
39	Chau-Ngan-pha ...	Do. ...	Khut-singa. 7	777	1415	30	Do.	
	No King	Khut-saw ... 37	807	1445	3	Do.	
40	Chau-Lam-Kon-Kam-pha.	*	Rai-saw ... 40	810	1448	13	Do. ...	* Said to be an uncle (probably descendant of an uncle) of Chau-Wak-pha, No. 34, and nearest remaining relative of Chau-Ngan-pha, No. 39.
41	Chau-Hum-pha ...	Son ...	Rai-si ... 53	823	1461	29	Do.	Surnamed Kyie-poi-poi-ma (see note, p. 23).
42	Chau-Kan-pha ...	Do. ...	Dap-raw ... 22	852	1490	6	Do.	
43	Chau-Pim-pha ...	Do. ...	Rung-mau ... 28	858	1496	20	Do. ...	
44	Chau-Hum-pha ...	Do. ...	Rung-kin ... 43	878	1516	88	Do.	Of Theinni.
45	Chau Poring ...	Do. ...	Kat-mau ... 16	966	1604	...	Do. ...	

OBSERVATIONS.

Such, then, are the few particulars I have been able to gather regarding the consecutive events in the history of the central kingdom of the Mau Shans. From this time forward the loss of their independence was complete, and the kingdom has since remained a mere group of petty dependent states, or tsaubwaships, under the provincial government of Yunnan. Beyond this, therefore, it is scarcely worth while to follow their history; but before going on to sketch the various branches or dependencies of the kingdom as they existed previous to its fall, it may be as well to take a glance at some of the notices that have already appeared bearing on Tai history generally, and which have emanated for the most part from travellers in the neighbouring countries of Munnipur, Asam, Western China, Siam, &c.

The most noteworthy of these is Major Boileau Pemberton's account of the kingdom of Pong derived from a Shan manuscript chronicle, which he obtained and caused to be translated during his mission to Munnipur in 1833.* In this document the first king's name recorded is that of one Khool-lie, "whose reign," writes Major Pemberton, "is dated as far back as the 80th year of the Christian era, and from whom to the time of Murgnow, in the year 667 A.D., the names of twelve kings are given, who are described as having gradually extended their conquests from north to south, and the names of no less than twenty-seven tributary cities are mentioned which acknowledged the supremacy of Murgnow * * * *. In the year 777 A.D. Murgnow died leaving two sons called Sookampha and Samlongpha, of whom the eldest, Sookampha, succeeded to the throne of Pong, and in his reign we find the first traces of a connection with the more eastern countries, many of which he appears to have succeeded in bringing under subjection to his authority." The story is then told of Samlongpha's campaign against Munnipur, Tipurah, &c., and the attempt made by his brother, Sookampha, to poison him, which attempt is said to have been frustrated by their mother giving Samlongpha timely warning. "From the death of Sookampha in the year

* *Report on the Eastern Frontier of British India*, Calcutta, 1835. Dr. Anderson (*Expedition to Western Yunnan*, Chapter I.) gives an abstract of Major Pemberton's report supplemented by many valuable notes of his own.

808," continues the report, "to the accession of Soognampha in 1315, the names of ten kings only are given * * * * *, but about the year 1332 A.D. some disagreements led to collision between the frontier villages of the Pong king's territory and those of Yunnan.

"An interview was appointed between the kings of Pong and China, to take place at the town of Mongsee, which is said to have been five* days' distant from Mongmaorong, the capital of Pong. The Chinese sovereign, with whom this interview took place, is named in the chronicle Chowongtee,† and Shuntee, the last prince of the twentieth imperial dynasty, is in the best chronological tables described as having ascended the throne of China in the year 1333. * * * * *. The Chinese however determined on subjugating the Pong dominions, and after a protracted struggle of two years' duration, the capital of Mogaung or Mongmaorong was captured by a Chinese army, under the command of a general called Yang-chang-soo, and the king Soongampha with his eldest son, Sookeepha, fled to the king of Pagan or Ava for protection. They were demanded by the Chinese general, to whom the Burmese surrendered them, and were carried into China, from whence they never returned."

So far will be sufficient to follow Major Pemberton's story, for it is evident even from these few incidents, erroneous though some of them are, that this Munnipuri history of Pong is simply that of the Mau Shans, ante-dated by nearly five hundred years at the commencement, while as it proceeds, dates and events are made gradually to agree more closely by assigning unreasonable periods to the length of the reigns of the kings. The error doubtless arose in the first instance from the absence of an intelligible chronology in the original Shan record, and for want of fixed points in the contemporary annals of neighbouring countries by which to set up landmarks; but however this may be, we see that

* There can be little doubt that this is a mere error in the number of days given, as Major Pemberton could not have regarded any part of Pong or Mau as being within five days of Mung-Kyie (pronounced Mung-Si by the Burmese), or the modern Yunnan-foo.

† Evidently intended for the reign of Cheng-tsu-wen-ti (A.D. 1403—1425) of the Ming dynasty and not Shunti of the Yüans. (See above p. 21 note.)

on arriving at the death of Chau-Ngan-pha, Major Pemberton's date is only about one hundred years in arrear of the correct date,* and that some four hundred years have had to be distributed over the reigns of the intervening kings. Thus it is that twelve kings are made to reign for 587 years, or an average of nearly 49 years each; the 13th, Murgnow (a name impossible to recognise), reigns for the astounding period of 110 years; the 14th for 31 years, and the remaining 10 for 507 years; giving an average for the whole twenty-four of very nearly $51\frac{1}{2}$ years, or more than double the usual period, and sufficient, in itself, to show the erroneous nature of the story from a chronological point of view.†

And if Major Pemberton's report has failed in this respect, it has hardly been more successful in fixing the site of the capital of Pong. "To the Munnipoorees," he says, "the whole country under its ancient limits was, and is still, known as the kingdom of Pong, of which the city called by the Burmahs Mogaung, and by the Shans Mongmaorong, was the capital." But Mung-mao or Mung-mao-lung (great Mung-Mao) exists to the present day under this same name, on the Shueli, and as will be seen below in the notice of Mogaung, there is no evidence of that place having at any time been called by the name of Mung Mao-rong or Mung Mao-lung by the Shans, while it is certain that Mung-mau was never known to the Burmese as Mogaung. Also by referring to Major Hannay,‡ the most original enquirer into matters connected with the Shans of whom we have any record, we see that§ such of these people as he conversed with, assigned "the south-west corner of the province of Yunnan as the seat of the Empire, and the capital, *Kai*

* Fixed as I have shown in the introduction.

† In England, from the conquest to William IV. (inclusive), the average comes to 22 years 8 months. The entire line of 243 Chinese sovereigns from Fu-hi to Taikwang (B.C. 2852 to 1847 A.D.) according to Williams (*Mid. Kingdom II.*, p. 229) averages $19\frac{1}{2}$ years, and Turnour (*As. Journ.*, XXIII, p. 186, 1837) gives a list of 37 Buddhist princes of ancient India, with a proportion of 16 years and 9 months to each reign.

‡ *Sketch of Singphos, &c.*, Calcutta, 1847, p. 54.

§ Dr. Anderson accepts the Shueli as the river on which the Pong capital is to be found, but oddly enough, misses identifying it with the capital of what he terms the "Muangmo State," and connects it with a small town called Manlung on the upper waters of that river, and the name of which he regards as bearing close affinity to Mongmaorong. (*Expedition to Yunnan*, Chapter I, *passim*.)

Khao Mau Loung (the great and splendid city)," was said to have been "situated on the Shueli river, or Lung-Shué of the Chinese, which falls into the Irawaddy river in latitude 24° north." This can be no other than the second capital of the Mau State, which I have mentioned above as Ka-Kao-Mung-lung or Ma-Kao-Mung-Lung,* and which is said to have been situated on the right bank of the Shueli about two or three miles due east from the present town of Mung Mau, and consequently only some six miles to the west of the original capital of Mung-Ri Mung-Ram.

Into the subject of the origin of the Pong nation or people Major Pemberton does not enter, but alludes briefly to the traditional accounts given of themselves by the Ahoms to Dr. Francis Hamilton Buchanan in the early years of this century, a people whom he rightly regarded as springing from a common origin with the inhabitants of Pong. Dr. Buchanan's original writings are much scattered and difficult of access, but an apparently full précis of his report on Asam is given by Montgomery Martin,† from which the following account is epitomised:—

"Many ages ago," two brothers called Khunlai and Khuntai descended from Heaven and alighted on a hill named Chorai Korong, situated in the Patkoi range, south from Gorgango, the ancient capital of Asam. Khunlai taking with him some attendants and the God Cheng went towards the south-east and took possession of a country called Nora, which his descendants continue to govern. Khuntai remained in the vicinity of the hill Chorai Korong and kept in his possession the God Chung, who is still considered by his descendants as their tutelary deity. Dr. Buchanan believes the "Heaven" to mean some part of Thibet bordering on China,‡ but the original word, whatever it may have been, he continues, has, since the conversion of of Khuntai's descendants to Brahmanism been translated *Sworgo* [Heaven]. * * * *. The original territory

* I have been unable to obtain a meaning for the name as given, and indeed cannot be sure that I have written it correctly, reaching me, as it did, through two foreign languages.

† *Eastern India*, III, p. 600 *et seq.* See also *Ritter*, IV, p. 307, and *Edinburgh Phil. Journal* (1820), II, p. 263, in which latter he tells us the country of Nora or Tay-lung was called "by their neighbours of Kasi or Moitay [*i.e.*, Munnipur] the kingdom of Bong."

‡ In this view he is followed by Klaproth (*Mém. relatifs à l'Asie*, III, p. 416).

occupied by Khuntai included two very long islands formed by branches of the Brahmaputra, together with some of the lands adjacent on both banks of that great river. Thirteen princes in regular succession from father to son continued to govern this territory with great success according to the rules of their ancestors, the names of whom are given as follows, but no dates or any indications from which dates could be inferred:—

- | | |
|---------------|-----------------|
| 1. Khuntai. | 7. Chhachonong. |
| 2. Chukapha. | 8. Chupinong. |
| 3. Chutaupha. | 9. Chhuchong. |
| 4. Chubinong. | 10. Churang. |
| 5. Chuinong. | 11. Chujang. |
| 6. Tukophi. | 12. Chuppak. |

13 Chukum.

Here again is a sufficient resemblance in the general story to that I have given above of Kunlung and Kunlai, to establish a common origin between the Pong and the Mau, though the names of the mythical founders of the kingdoms are not alike, nor do their movements correspond entirely in both accounts. In fact it would appear that each separate section of the Shans, though acknowledging in a general way a common origin illustrated by fables of striking resemblance, place the scene of both origin and fables in the particular region they chance to inhabit. Thus in a third direction, that of the Laos in the extreme S.-W. of Yunnan, Garnier obtained a tradition of the origin of that section of the Tai race of a similar tenor to the foregoing, and containing names that show close affinity. He tells us* that after a God called Phya Then had created the heavens and the earth, there were three princes named respectively Lauseun, Khun Khet and Khon Khan, who founded kingdoms (des muongs), and who were exhorted by Phya Then to live in peace and to honour the spirits of the dead. He was not obeyed however, and after punishing the inhabitants of the earth with a deluge, in which great numbers were drowned, the survivors begged for grace, and Phya Then sent them Phya Kun Borom to govern them and Phya Pitse nu-kan (le grand architecte du ciel) to spread abundance in the land. Kun Borom founded Muong Then in

* *Voyage d'Exploration*, &c., I, p. 473 et suiv.

Tongking. He had seven sons who founded various kingdoms as follows:—

1. Kun Lang, who founded Muong Choa (Mung Shua).
2. Kun Falang, who founded Muong Ho (which is to the present day, as Garnier remarks (p. 474), the Laotian name for the province of Yunnan)* according to some, and according to others Han Savady (*i.e.*, Hentha-Wadi or Pegu).
3. Kun Chou-Soung. He founded Mung Keo or Annam.
4. Kun Sai-fong. The founder of Muong Zuon, according to some Muong Yong, and according to others Xieng-Mai (Zimmei).
5. Ngou-En. The founder, according to some accounts, of Muong Poueun, and according to others, of Muong Ayuthia (or Siam).
6. Kun Lo Koung—who founded Muong Phong or Muong-Sai-Koun.
7. Kun Chetcheun,—who founded Muong Kham Kheut Kham Muong or Muong Poueun.

The histories of some of these is then briefly followed, but without any definite result, though Garnier believes that in the kingdom of the 6th son of Kun Borom may, perhaps, be recognised the Pong of Pemberton.

But the points that are especially remarkable are the agreement of the Laotian god, Phya Then (or God Then), with the Mau god, Ten-Kam, and the similarity in the name of one of the three original princes, Lanseun, with the Laungu of the Mau tradition, and the general tenor of the story of the seven sons being sent to establish kingdom's all over Indo-China as in the case of Kunlung's posterity. The names of Khun-Khet and Khon-Khan I would hesitate to connect with Kun-Lung and Kun-Lai, as Kun or Khun is probably only the royal title, meaning king; still the dual nature of their original kings is a prominent feature in this as

* Garnier also remarks that this Muong-Ho was perhaps the kingdom known to Chinese authors as Nan-Chao which in the 8th century embraced the greater part of Yunnan, and I have been informed, in Burnah, that Mung-Ho was the name of a Shan State within the Chinese border.

well as in the Mau and Asamese accounts and indeed in that of Siam.

In a comparatively enlightened country such as Siam, where the king, himself, has endeavoured to write the history of his dominions,* it might be expected that much material would be forthcoming for tracing the origin of the race. But on the contrary all goes to show that the Siamese have little or no ancient history or historical tradition of earlier date than the founding of their first national capital, Ayudia, at the commencement of the 14th century. It is true that Buddhism is related to have been introduced at the comparatively early period of the 7th century,† but it appears to have left, in the interval between that time and the founding of Ayudia, no records that could be turned to historical account. The only national legend that I am acquainted with is that given by Sir J. Bowring‡ on the authority of Bishop Pallegoix, which attributes the origin of the Tai to two Brahminical recluses named Satxanalai and Sitthimongkhon (the orthography is probably Pallegoix's). These personages are said to have dwelt in the woods at a period coeval with Phra Kodom—the last Buddha—or about 623 to 543 B.C. Neither the locality of the woods in question or anything more tangible than childish fables regarding the lives of the recluses are given; but the best authorities believe the Siamese to have migrated, only shortly before the founding of Ayudia, from the hill country towards the north and to have displaced the aboriginal Karens, by whom the country, now called Siam, was inhabited.

From this brief comparison of the various accounts available, it will be seen that, though the nature of the original traditions is one throughout, no coincidence exists with regard either to dates or the locality of the scenes, while the peculiar broken up and scattered condition of the race has doubtless caused the tradition of each separate section

* See *Bowring's Siam* (Appendix) for a reprint of the King's history.

† In 639, according to Crawford (Vol. II, p. 92), during the reign of a chief or king named Krek, who in honour of the event instituted the popular era three years thereafter or in 642 A.D. Bowring (I, p. 36) believes that Buddhism did not reach the Siamese direct from India or Ceylon, but through Cambodia, where it had already been established by Phra Buddha Ghosa as early as the year of religion 965, or 422 A.D.

‡ *Siam*, Vol. I, p. 39.

to be influenced by those of neighbouring countries. So also with the names by which these sections have become known, and which cause us to find almost identical histories for Pongs, Ahoms, Maus, &c., &c., according, chiefly, to the language of the nearest neighbour, but which may possibly, at some future time, be traced up to one common source.

With regard to the name of Pong, though, from what we have seen above, there can be no doubt that it is merely the Munnipuri appellation for the whole of the once united Shan states of Upper Burmah and Western Yunnan, there is nothing on the Burmese side to show how it originated, or to throw any light on its meaning or connection. In the entire Mau history there is no mention of such a country as Pong, and nothing to show that the name was ever used by the Shans themselves; to the Burmese also the name is unknown, and, so far as I have been able to learn, to the Kachyens and the Chinese of Western Yunnan likewise. The only attempt to explain the word that I am acquainted with is that made by Hannay,* where he says:—"The Shans of Yunnan and of Burmah point to that part of Tibet lying to the north and east beyond the sources of the Irrawaddy, as the original country, which they call Moongfan or Phang, and is the Phong, Bong or Pong mentioned in the chronicles quoted by Dr. Taylor as belonging to the Munni-pooris, or Cathay [Kassei] branch of the Shan race—and hitherto considered as situated in the province of Mogoung." Thus he derives the name from the second syllable of *Moongfan*, while to the first syllable has been traced, I believe,† the origin of the entirely separate tribe called Mon or Talain, in Southern Burmah. One of the two must be incorrect. That Colonel Hannay himself scarcely accepts the derivation given by him, is apparent; for he adds—that neither Ahom or Shan chronicles show that any branch of the Shan race came into Asam previous to the beginning of the 13th century. This is undoubtedly correct, as we have seen above, and moreover they came in then from the south, and not from the north, as would have been the case if they had come from Tibet or Mungfan. Further, some trace of a northern

* *Sketch of Singpos, &c.*, p. 38.

† I have omitted to note the reference.

origin would surely have remained either in tradition, language,* or some other point, but Hannay mentions none, and I have been able to hear of none, while certainly the tradition of the Chutia or Sutya, given at p. 61 below, indicates no sign of a northern origin in the people of Upper Asam previous to the 13th century. Mungfan, or country of the Fan, would in all probability be represented by the land of the Si-fan and Tufan—names by which the tribes inhabiting the eastern portion of Tibet are known to the Chinese,† and with whom the Shans of Khamti and the neighbourhood may have been in communication at some period of their history, but who have little affinity with them, I conceive, from an ethnological point of view.‡

The fact, however, of a certain people being known to their neighbours by a name entirely foreign to themselves is in no way remarkable, and is abundantly established in the northern regions of Indo-China as the following list of mutual appellations will show. But it may be worth while to notice that the meaning of the word *Pong* or *Bhong* in Tai is, as in Burmese, *grand* or *glorious*, and that it is employed in the titles of the more celebrated only among their kings both in the Mau and the Mogaung books, while the ordinary princes—those not regarded as heroes—are not honoured with it. An instance of the full title would run thus “Chau Lung *Wak pha pong sium ngam mung*,” or translated word for word “Lord great *Wak* ruler, glorious seal, wealthy country;” *Pong sium*, being the heroic title and meaning “(bolder of the) glorious seal.” There still remains then the possible explanation that the Shans of the Kubo valley and thereabouts gave themselves, or their race generally, the

* It is true Garnier (I., p. 480, foot-note) points out that the Sifan letters given by Father Amyot bear a strong resemblance to those of the “Pe-y or Shans,” but this would apply equally to the Burmese, and goes more towards throwing light on the origin of their written character than on the race itself.

† The *Tanguts* of northern Tibet according to Captain N. Prshewalski (*Russische Revue*, 1875, No. 6).

‡ Hannay informs us (p. 69) that the Shans placed Mungfan to the N. E. of the Bor Khamti country, and that both Shans and Chinese regarded it as bounded on the north “by Thian Shan Nanlu”! A most remarkable indication of Tibet and the Sifans certainly, but where did the Shans learn the name of “Thian Shan Nanlu”?—or even the Chinese of Western Yunnan for that matter? (For the position of Mungfan, according to Hannay and Duhalde, see Ritter's *Karte von Asam, Ost-Bengalen, &c.*, 1840.)

name of Pong or "glorious ones," and that thence the Munnipuris learned it; and if this is the case, it would only be in keeping with other barbarous nations in their vicinity, such as the Chinese who call themselves "Celestial," and the Asamese, "unrivalled"—names which are simply the outcome of national ignorance and self-glorification, but which have no ethnological significance.

Names by which some† of the nations surrounding the Mau Shans are known to each other.

By the Shans	... The Burmese	...	Man.
	Kachyens	...	Han or Kan.
	Chinese	...	Kyei or Chyei.
	Nagas	...	Khang.
	Themselves	...	Tai or Kun.
By the Burmese	... The Shans	...	Shan or Shyan.‡
	Chinese	...	Tarok or Tarop.
	Siamese	...	Yodia Shyan.
	Nagas	...	Khyen.
	Munnipuris	...	Kathei.
	Asamese	...	Athan or Weithali.
By the Chinese	... The Shans	...	Pa-I. §
	Kachyens	...	Yei-Jên.
	Siamese	...	Sien lo.
	Burmese	...	Mien or Lau Mien.¶
	Asamese	...	Weisali.
By the Munnipuris	... The Burmese	...	Awa.
	Asamese	...	Tekau.
	Chinese	...	Khagi.
	Shans	...	Kapo (Kubbo), Pong.
	Nagas	...	Hau.**
	Themselves...	...	Moitei.

* From *Oshomo* unequalled, unrivalled, whence *Ahom*, corrupted by the Hindoos into *Asam*. The word *Slav* (i.e., the Slavonians in Eastern Europe) I believe also means *glorious*.

† This list is far from complete, but if extended to all the minor tribes, especially towards the East, it might throw considerable light on the ethnology of the region. The Siamese I have only at second-hand.

‡ Whence Siam.

§ The cultivated valleys and uplands among the hills of Western Yunnan are called "Pa;" "I" means barbarian. Thus "valley barbarians."

|| Simply "wild men." They distinguish however between Ta-Yei-Jên and Siau Yei-Jên—great and small wild men; the former being, I believe, the Singpos proper and Kakus, and the latter the southern Kachyens or Kanams.

¶ The Burmese Mran, or Myan. The character employed by the local Chinese for the "Lau" is that meaning "old;" whether correct or not is doubtful, but it has, I believe, no reference to the Lowas or Laos.

** Almost exactly the name by which the Khyens in Northern Aracan speak of themselves—viz., *Hiou* or *Shou*, which in the orthography I have adopted throughout

By the Asamese	... The Chinese Khei.
	Shans Sam.
	Kachyens Singpo.
	Munnipuris Moglu.
	Siamese Yutara.
	Burmese Man, Mantara.
	Themselves... Ahom.
By the Kachyens	... The Shans Sam.
	Burmese Mian.
	Chinese Mowa.
	Themselves Singpo or Ching-paw.
By the Siamese	... The Burmese Mang.
	Chinese Khei.
	Asamese Mung-lung.
	Munnipuris Kassei.
	Themselves... Tai.

this paper would become *Hiau* or *Shau* (see Major Freyer in *British Burmah Gazette*, May 16th, 1874, Supplement, p. 189). These regard the Shindus, Kumis, and Lungkhes as members of the same race as themselves and have a tradition that they came originally from the sources of the Kyendwen (*ibid*). There can be little doubt that the Khyens of the Burmese and the Khangs of the Shans (our Nagas) are one race, and Colonel Yule found that one of the original traditions of the Karens was identical with a legend of the Khyens (*Ava*, p. 296), while the late Captain Butler (*J.A.S.B.*, XLV., No. IV., 1875), quotes Latham to the effect that "word for word Khyen is Karen." On these and other grounds there is fair reason to believe that the Nagas, Khyens and Karens may, on further investigation, prove to be divisions of one people.

THE STORY OF MOGAUNG.

The most important province or section of the Mau kingdom under the central state of Mung-Mau, or Kusambi, was that known at the present day as Mogaung. Not only was it the most extensive but it was usually also more powerful than the other sections, and its history, as an independent state, outlasted that of Mung-Mau by some 150 years.

In the legend of Kun-Lung we saw that the western portion of the province was said to have been occupied by him in the earliest days of Mau history, but from the date of this fabulous, or half fabulous, occurrence down to the time of Sam-Lung-pha, little or nothing is to be found about it except when occasionally mentioned as the country of the Nora; and indeed it is most probable that until conquered by Sam-Lung-pha it (together with parts of Khamti, &c.), formed an entirely independent Nora state, and possibly, though I have heard of none as yet, annals may exist to this day recording their history. For the Noras were a comparatively civilized people, and the few who remain are still regarded in Mogaung, Khamti, and Upper Asam as a learned class, and are generally employed among the Buddhist priesthood and others as astronomers and writers. From the little I have been able to glean of the Noras from native sources it would seem that they formerly constituted the aboriginal population of the region in question, but afterwards became mixed with the Mau and Khamti Shans. Their original seat was probably in Khamti, though in former times that province extended far beyond its present limits towards the south and west, and was divided into two districts called Ai-Kham and Ai-Ton, the former to the north, the latter to the south.* They were a

* The western part was afterwards called Sankring Khamti but this was not an original division of the country. Wilcox was informed by the Khamti Shans that they themselves came from the region bordering on Siam and Yunnan, and that at the time of their first arrival in their present locality the country was inhabited "by Lamas or the "Khaphok tribe."—Wilcox could find no trace of their having at any time had intercourse with Tibet (*Selections, Bengal Government*, No. XXIII, 1855, p. 117, and *Asiatick Researches*, XVII., p. 441 &c). Major Pemberton fixed the home of the Noras in Upper Asam—in the country of the Moamerias or Muttucks—but in the next sentence he says—"The Shan Chieftain of Mogaung is also called the Nora Rajah by the Singphos, and it appears that the term is also applied to the Shans—"

valley-dwelling agricultural people and superior in point of civilization to the hill tribes by whom they were surrounded, but whether, in the first instance, of a purely Tai race or an offshoot of some Tibetan tribe it is impossible to form an opinion. Their independence seems to have dated down to about the reign of the Mau King, Chau-kam-pha, when the general, Sam-Lung-pha, prior to his extensive conquests appears to have been created first Tsaubwa or chief ruler of the greater part of their country, under the suzerainty of his brother. The precise date of Sam-Lung-pha's accession in Nora is somewhat uncertain, but 577 of the Burmese era or 1215 A.D., is the year generally indicated in the Shan records, and would not be far from the truth.* At this time, it is related, that Sam-Lung-pha in crossing the river now known as the Nam Kaung (Mogaung river), a short distance above the site of the present Mogaung, found a sapphire drum † in the bed of the stream, and, regarding it as a good omen, at once established a town near the spot, and called it Mung-kaung or "drum town."‡ He retained the sapphire, and it was afterwards handed down to his successors, and held by them for many generations as a mark of power.

The Mogaung annals claim for their first chief, the government of eight separate races who were divided into ninety-nine§ Tsaubwaships and spread over the following provinces:— (1) Khamti; (2) Sankring Khamti (or Western Khamti on the Kyendwen); (3) Hukung; (4) Maing-Kaing; (5) Maing-Ngyaung; (6) Mo-Nyin; (7) Taungthwot (Sumjok); (8) Kalei; (9) the four Yaw towns (the most northern of the districts inhabited by the Yaws); (10) Mautshobo. This is probably an exaggeration, especially as regards the southern

between Hookong and Mogaung." (*Eastern Frontier*, p. 68.) The two statements are scarcely reconcilable, but the latter I believe to be correct; and moreover it coincides with Fr. Hamilton (Buchanan), who says they spoke a dialect very little different from that of Siam, called themselves *Tay-Loun* (Tai-lung, i.e., great Tai or Shans), and had "Princes of the same family with the dynasty which then [*circa* 1795] governed Asam." Their kingdom was called by the Munnipuris *Bong*. (*Edinh. Phil. Journal* II., p. 263, 1820).

* This would be five years earlier than his brother's accession to Mung-mau.

† *Kaung* is said to mean "drum;" a sapphire in the shape of a drum is probably meant.

‡ The adopted Pali name is Udigiri-rata.

§ Meaning probably an indefinite, large number.

provinces, or if not, it must at all events be regarded as the greatest extension to which Mogaung ever attained, for like the other Shan provinces its extent fluctuated greatly with the varying fortunes of its rulers. The eight races were (1) the Noras, divided into the Ai-Ton, the Ai-Kham, and Fakei (the latter were not true Noras, but fugitives from Mung-Mau); (2) the Khang or Khang-sei, (*i.e.*, the Khyens or Nagas); (3) the Singphos or Kachyens; (4) The Pwons, divided into great and small Pwons; (5) the Kadus, a kindred people to the latter, similarly divided; (6) the Yaws, a tribe of Burmans on the right bank of the Irawaddy; (7) the Kunbaw (said to be the Burmese of the neighbourhood of Mautshobo); (8) the Kunungs and Kumuns, or Mishmis, divided by the Asamese into Miju and Chullicotta Mishmis.

Sam-Lung-pha's reign, as tsaubwa of Mogaung, lasted only thirteen years, for in 1228, while engaged in his western conquests, he appears to have been succeeded by a nephew named Noi-San-pha, a son of the Mau king, but who in assuming the tsaubwanship took his father's name, Chau-Kam-pha. His descendants continued to reign uneventfully and in regular succession until the year 1443 A.D., when Chau-Si-pha, the brother of the unfortunate Chau-Ngan-pha, as we have already seen in the history of the Mung-Mau line, succeeded to the tsaubwanship. He was surnamed Chau-Kwon-pha, and his reign at Mogaung is recorded to have lasted for the extraordinary period of fifty years. He was followed in 1493 by the Mung-Mau king, Chau-Kaa-pha, who had abdicated (as we have seen, p. 23 *ante*) in favour of his son on suffering a defeat from the Chinese, and had retired first to Khamti and afterwards to Mogaung. To signalise his accession and to commemorate the beginning, as he probably hoped, of a new era in Mogaung, he founded a new capital at a distance of one day's journey to the N. W. of old Mogaung, and which at first was known by the name of Tsei-Lan, but afterwards by that of Tsei-En or Chei-En. From here he set out with a considerable army to undertake the conquest of Asam, but on arriving at the border of that country the Ahom king offered him large presents of cattle and horses, and he retired peacefully to Tsei-En. Chau-Kaa-pha is also said to have built another city called Pha-kung, now

in ruins; but the position of this place I cannot ascertain. His reign lasted twenty-four years, and some time before his death he distributed various portions of his country among his relatives and others whom he appointed governors or tributary tsaubwas. Thus one Chau-Lung-Tu-mung is said to have been appointed governor of a district called Mansai on the right bank of the Kyendwen, and Tsa-Tsaw-Yot was created governor of another district, on the opposite bank, called Maing-Tung. The country of the Kunungs and Kumuns (Mishmis), together with Ta-Wi and Ta-Wai,* he gave to Chau-Lung-Mung-Chang; Kassei, or Munnipur to Haw Yot, and three districts of the Khang-sei, or Naga country, to one Chau-ho-tom. To his only son, named Chau-Hun-pha, he assigned the Yaw country west of the Kyendwen, and thus it was that the latter did not succeed his father in the tsaubwaship of Mogaung.

So far the Mogaung tsaubwas had all been of the Mau line, but here a break occurred for about ninety years, commencing with Chau-Kaa-pha's minister, Chau-sui-pha or Sam-Lung-pawmaing, as his title had previously been, and who reigned for six years. His successor was one Chau-Sui-Kwei (surnamed Chau-Peng), but of what relationship to the pawmaing or any previous tsaubwa there is nothing to show. In the 30th year of this prince's reign (Lakli Rung-maw 28=1556 A.D.) a Burmese army despatched by the king of Hentha-wadi (Pegu) invaded Mogaung and conquered it, establishing priests and teachers for converting the people to Buddhism. The Tsaubwa gave in his submission and became a tributary chief; two years afterwards he died, and was followed for four reigns (forty-seven years) by his lineal descendants, during which time war was frequently carried on, in a desultory way, with the Burmese, but never with the result of effecting absolute independence, except for a short time during the reign of the last of the four, Chau-Hum-pha. The most formidable of these wars, however, was one waged by the second of the four tsaubwas, called Chau-Kaa-pha II. (No. 15 of table below). The king of Pegu, known

* The situation of this district is said to be towards the north. Can it have any connection with the central of the three southern provinces of Tibet, called by the Chinese *Wai* or *Wei*? It can have no reference to Tavoy.

by the title Sing-pyu-mya-yen, had had several wars with the Siamese, in some of which Mogaung, Monyin, Momeit, &c., were asked, or ordered, to take part, and had generally done so until the reign of Chau-Kaa-pha II., who on one occasion refused assistance to the Peguans, and thereby brought on a war in his own country which lasted three years. His army was eventually beaten and he was taken prisoner to Pegu, where he was exposed for seven days at each of the twenty gates of the king's palace.

In 1605, with the sanction of the Pegu king, a prince of Mung-Mau called Chau-Tit-pha, probably a grandson of Chau-Hum-pha,* was placed on the throne of Mogaung, and from this time until the final subjection of the province to the Burmese, the Mau line remained intact. They were, however, never thoroughly independent except for short intervals during periods of weakness or dissension in Burma.

The only remarkable point in Chau-Tit-pha's reign was the founding of the present town of Mogaung. At his death in 1626 a tsaubwa of Maing-Lung, near Momiet, was appointed by the Burmese king, but though he received allegiance from the people of Mogaung, he never resided in the province, and three years after his accession died, leaving no heir. The queen of Chau-Tit-pha named Lang-chu-paw, who had meanwhile been acting as regent during the absence of the Maing-Lung tsaubwa, now continued the regency for a further period of ten years when she was created tsaubwa in her own right and filled the post for an additional term of twelve years.

After the death of the queen in 1651 nothing noteworthy occurred until the year 1751, when a tsaubwa called Haw Seing (*i.e.*, gem of the palace) after a reign of nine years abdicated in favour of his son. The reason given in the Mogaung history is that his pride would no longer allow him to remain tributary to the Burmese, but in all probability an unsuccessful war occurred about this time which obliged the chief to take flight. In any case the son, called Haw Kam (or golden palace), died after seventeen years when

* See under Mung-Mau p. 25 *ante*, and No. 44, Table I.

Haw Seing returned from his retirement and again assumed power. He was attacked with leprosy, and in consequence built a Haw or royal residence called Lang Seng near the north end of the Endawgyi lake, to which he retired after three years. A Burmese official called MOUNG KIAW was then sent from Ava to act as tsaubwa, but, according to the Shan account, he proved a traitor and joined with the tsaubwas of Bamo, Theinni, and other places in inducing the Chinese to make war upon Burma. But however this may have been, Mogaung became mixed up in the war between Burma and China, which commenced in 1765,* and in the course of which MOUNG KIAW fled to China, leaving his brother, MOUNG PIU, to administer the province. The latter died in 1775, and the Burmese being fully engaged in reorganising their country after the wars, allowed the Shans of Mogaung to replace old Haw Seing at the head of affairs. He lived, however, only for two years, and after his death in 1777 the tsaubwaship became vacant for eight years. A Shan named Yaw-pan-kyung was then placed in power and succeeded, for a time, in attaining a certain degree of independence, but the Burmese attacked him, took him prisoner, and eventually put him to death after plundering his palace and committing great havoc in the town. This was in B.E. 1158 or 1796 A.D., and from that time forward Mogaung became an integral part of the kingdom of Burma, and was governed by woons appointed from Ava—only one break occurring, *viz.*, from 1840 to 1843, when an Asamese prince, called Tipum Raja (brother to the exiled prince of that country, then confined at the Court of Ava), was created tsaubwa of Mogaung, and in addition received the district of Bamo as a jaghire.

* See Burney in *J.A.S.B.*, VI., pt. I., p. 128 *et seq.* for a full account of the war from the Burmese point of view.

Table of Mogaung Tsaubwas.

No.	NAME.	Relationship to the preceding.	COMMENCEMENT OF REIGN.				Capital.	REMARKS.
			Name of Shan year or Lakli.	Burmese era.	A. D.	Length of reign in years.		
1	Sam-Lung-pha	Khut-mit	47	577	1215	13	Old Mogaung. Otherwise Sam-lung-kung-maing, son of No. 31 of Mung-Mau.
2	Chau-Kam-pha ...	Nephew	Kaa-kiu	60	580	1223	20	Do. This was his father's name which he assumed; his real name was Noi-San-pha.
3	Chau-Kun-law ...	Son ...	Kaa-mut	20	610	1243	60	Do.
4	Chau-Pu-Reing ...	Do. ...	Kaa-mut	20	670	1303	36	Do.
5	Chau-Tei-pha ...	Do. ...	Kat-mut	56	706	1344	2	Do.
6	Pwa-Ngan-maing..	Do. ...	Rung-raw	59	703	1346	15	Do.
7	Kun-Tau-pha ...	Do. ...	Bai-saw	13	723	1561	20	Do.
8	Chau-Hung-pha ...	Do. ...	Bai-san	33	743	1391	30	Do.
9	Chau-Pin-pha ...	Do. ...	Bai-ngi	3	773	1411	35	Do.
10	Chau-Si-pha	Rung-plaw	38	803	1446	50	Do. Surnamed Chau-Kwon-pha. He was brother of Chau-Ngan-pha (No. 39) Mung-Mau.
11	Chau-Kaa-pha	Rong-mau	23	858	1496	24	Chei-En Surnamed Chau-Eyek-pha.
12	Sam-Lung-paw-maing.	...	Dap-mau	52	882	1520	6	Do. ... Otherwise Chau-Sui-sin. Here the Mau line breaks off.
13	Chau-Sui-kwei	Rung-raw	58	888	1526	32	Uncertain Surnamed Chau-peng.
14	Chau-Hum-pha ...	Son ...	Kaa-sin	30	920	1558	6	Do.
15	Chau-Kaa-pha ...	Do. ...	Kat-kiu	36	926	1564	19	Do.
16	Chau-Kon-kam ...	Do. ...	Plek-singa	55	945	1583	6	Do.
17	Chau-Hum-pha ...	Do. ...	Bai-ngi	3	953	1591	14	New Mogaung. He became temporarily independent of Burmah.
18	Chau-Tit-pha	Khut-si	17	967	1605	21	Do. Surnamed Chau-kaa-maing, and probably a grandson of Chau-Hum-pha (No. 44) of Mung-Mau. Here Mau line recommences.
19	Chau-Sain-Lung	Rung-plaw	33	938	1626	3	Do. } The country administered by Chau-Tit-pha's queen, No. 20.
	No King	Kap-si	41	991	1629	10	Do.
20	Lang-Chu-paw	Kap-ngi	51	1001	1639	12	Uncertain Dowager queen of Chau-Tit-pha.
21	Cheing-Lang-Ho-Hup.	Adopted son.	Bai-ngi	3	1013	1651	12	Maing-kwon. Said to be a minister's title.
22	Chau-Sui-Yaw ...	Son ...	Plek-ngi	15	1025	1663	10	Do.

Table of Mogaung Tsaubwas—(Concluded.)

No.	NAME.	Relationship to the preceding.	COMMENCEMENT OF REIGN.				Length of reign, years.	Capital.	REMARKS.
			Name of Shan year or Lakli.	Burmese era.	A. D.				
23	Chau-Sui-Kyek	Plek-saw	25	1035	1673	56	Mogaung	Said to have been a grandson of Chau-Hum-pha (No. 44) of Mung-Mau.
24	Chau-Hum ...	Son ...	Kap-san	21	1091	1723	10	Do.	Born at Ava and called by the Burmese Chau-Maung-pu.
25	Haw-Seing ...	Do. ...	Kap-singa	31	1101	1739	9	Do.	
26	Haw-Kam ...	Do. ...	Kaa-mau	40	1110	1748	17	Do.	
	Again Haw-Seing	...	Khut-san	67	1127	1765	3	L a n g-Seing.	
27	Maung-Kiaw ...	Son? ...	Kaa-kiu	60	1130	1768	3	Mogaung	A Burmese. His Shan name was, perhaps, Haw-Kam.
28	Maung-Piu ...	Brother	Rai-ngi	3	1133	1771	4	Do.	
	Again Haw-Seing	...	Khut-singa	7	1137	1775	2	Do.	
	No King	...	Taw-san	9	1139	1777	8	Do.	
29	Chau-Yaw-Pan-Kyung.	...	Khut-si	17	1147	1785	11	Do.	Was captured by the Burmese in B.E. 1158 or A.D. 1796.

THEINNI.

Mung-Siuen-wi, the Theinni of the Burmese and Mupang of the Chinese, is perhaps the state next in importance; its history is probably well preserved in chronicles belonging to the tsaubwaship, but my translator has been unable to obtain any original book, and the following brief sketch has been chiefly extracted from a Burmese work called the Zabu-Oke-Saung, though some natives of Theinni were also consulted.

The first king was a native Shan called Kinta-ho-hung, who founded the original city of Siuen-wi towards the end of the first century after Buddha's Nirvana. Shortly afterwards, on the 4th day of the 2nd moon of the 102nd year of Religion (B.C. 441) he began to build a wall to surround the city, the form of which was a square of 1345 *ta**; the height was 10 cubits above the ground and 2 cubits below ground; the thickness $10\frac{1}{2}$ cubits; outside the wall, was constructed a moat 5 *ta* broad and 20 cubits deep, while between the wall and the moat a space was left of 2 *ta* in breadth. There were 11 gates in the wall each 8 cubits wide, but the material of which the wall was constructed is not mentioned. Ten days' journey to the south of the city a stone post was erected to mark the southern limit of the kingdom and the border between it and Monei. Its position was 5 *daings* or about 10 miles due south of the village of Man-thaw. The country also extended towards the S. W., a distance of 10 days, as far as a place called Kaka-Selei-hi, which I cannot identify; to the west 4 days to the Naung-kre-sit lake and Thibo; to the N. W. 5 days as far as the headwaters of the Mytngei (called Haw-Mytngei); to the north 5 days as far as the Kenei-hill near the Shueli opposite Mung-Mau; to the N. E. as far as the border of the Chinese Shans of Kaing-Ma, &c.; and on the east to the Salween.†

In the year of Religion 219 = 324 B.C. Kintahung's dynasty came to an end, when an Indian prince

* The *Ta* consists of seven *cubits*, and the cubit is generally taken at eighteen English inches.

† These indications of the extent of the country are evidently modern, and are probably due to the Burmese author.

called Chandravonsa, a brother of Asoka's principal queen, Asandimitra, ascended the throne, and founded a new dynasty, at the same time commencing to build a new capital. Neither distance nor direction from the old capital is given, but it is said to have been commenced at the full of the twelfth moon of the year of Chandravonsa's accession. The dimensions were 1300 *ta* from N. to S., 1,500 *ta* from E. to W., with a total of 20 gates, or 5 on each side, and the entire structure was of bricks. Within the wall was built the palace with a gilt tower (*pya-that*), and when the Chinese came to know of this tower, they gave the capital the name of the "golden palace city" (*Shue-hnan-myo*). During Chandravonsa's reign a *rahan*, or priest, known as Mohendra Rahan, a son of Asoka, came on a visit to Theinni from Ceylon (or India—uncertain) where he had been preaching Buddhism. He built a monastery on the top of the Yangoma hill in the neighbourhood of the capital, and when finished took up his residence in it, accompanied by a hundred attendant priests. Here he remained only a few years, but on leaving he stepped upon a certain stone on the hill side, and left upon it his footprint, which, according to tradition, remains to the present day.

Chandravonsa was married to a niece of Asoka, named Nandakumari, and died at 70 years of age; he was followed by a son, after whom the reigns of fifteen kings, all of Shan names, are recorded, but without dates of any description until the fifteenth, who was called Kun-Lei-Pi-pha, whose accession is dated at about the year 470 of the Burmese era or 1108 A.D. But it is clearly impossible that sixteen reigns should have filled up the space of some 1362 years, thus this part of the history must be regarded as still in obscurity. However, it is related that during Kun-Lei-Pi-pha's reign the king of Pagan, Alaung-Si-Tu, came to Theinni on his way to China, and requested Kun-Lei-Pi-pha to accompany him as guide on his journey; this he did, and on his return in B.E. 473 = A.D. 1111 he received from the Pagan king the honorary title of "Dhamma," and then became known as Dhamma Chau-Hung-pha; he was also presented with a Burmese princess, called Mya-Wun, and two elephants as a token of gratitude for the services he had rendered while on the mission to China. Certain Buddhist relics, moreover,

which Alaung-Si-Tu had procured in China, were deposited in five pagodas built on the top of a hill near Theinni.*

In 498 B.E. = 1136 A.D. Dhamma Chau-Hung-pha died and was succeeded by his son called Kun-Lei, who, while on a pilgrimage to the footprint of Mohendra, omitted to conform to certain Buddhist rites, and was seized and buried alive by the Nats or spirits.

After Kun-Lei follow six names without dates, and with records of only fabulous events, after which we have a second Chau-Hung-pha, who became tsaubwa in 674 B.E. or 1312 A.D. This prince is said to have been nominated and placed on the throne by the Shan prince of Peng-ya, Tazisin-thi-hetu, who, together with two of his brothers, had shortly before deposed the last Pagan king, Kyosuwa, and was at this time supreme ruler of Peng-ya and Pagan. †

After this there is again an interval of six reigns with nothing but bare names recorded, but followed by one Kan-kei-pha who became tsaubwa in 768 B.E. = 1406 A.D., and six years afterwards was killed in battle by the heir-apparent of Ava. Then again follow six reigns without dates, after which a prince of the Shan name of Kan-Wat-pha became tsaubwa in B.E. 912 or 1550 A.D. He was called by the Burmese Maha-Chau-Hum-pha, but this was probably an honorific title only. In 918 B.E. or 1556 A.D. he (or perhaps his son Poreing)‡ submitted to the Pegu king when Theinni became a Burmese state, and the inhabitants were converted to Buddhism. After this Theinni frequently freed itself from the Burmese yoke, but for short intervals only.

* In connection with this journey of Alaung-Si-Tu may be mentioned a tradition of the Palaungs. These people pretend that on the way, the Pagan king fell in with a Taungbain (Palaung) tsaubwa, whom he instructed in a number of useful arts; among other things, in the use of weights and measures. He also taught him the value of the tea tree, and enjoined him to urge his people to cultivate it. As an example, the king planted the first tree with his own hands, and the legend is that it exists to the present day, the leaves being picked on great occasions for the use of high priests, and for sacrificial purposes. It is further related that the Palaung tsaubwa was converted to Buddhism by Alaung-Si-Tu at this time, and that the former spread it among his people. This was the first conversion of the Palaungs, but it was not complete until the general spread of Buddhism during the reign of the Pegu King (Sing-Piu-Mya-Yen, &c.), about the middle of the 16th century.

Apart from this tradition there is reason to believe that the Buddhism of the Palaungs is of older date than that of the Shans proper, and as a rule they are more strict in their observances.

† In this Burmese account no mention is made of the conquest of Theinni by Sam-Lung-pha, though it probably took place about, or shortly after, the year 1223 A.D.

‡ See pp. 25 and 27 above.

MOMIET AND ASAM.

At times Momiet was a state of some significance, and included the whole of the country between the left bank of the Irawaddy and Kusambi, or the provinces of Mung-Mau proper, as far north as the territory of the Khamti Shans, and comprising, consequently, the tsaubwaship of Bamo. The Shan name is Mung-Mit, but in the Zabú-Oke-Saung, *Mung-Mit-Kup-Kling-nau* is given as the full ancient appellation; the adopted Pali name was probably *Thiri-Rata* or *Rashtra*.

Good histories of Momiet are said to exist, but they are in possession of the priests, and difficult of access. The chief points of interest in the state are the ruby mines, the tea cultivation, and the fact that its tsaubwas have given off lines of ruling princes to several other states. Among the latter may be mentioned those of Monei, Mobyei, perhaps Peng-ya (who at one time ruled at Ava) and, notably, Asam.

The first tsaubwa of the Mau line was called Fu-Sang-Kang, the younger brother of the Mau king, Pam-Yau-Pung (No. 29 of the table, p. 27). His reign is believed to have commenced about the same time as that of his brother or in 565 B.E.=1203 A.D., but there was probably, anterior to this, a line of native chiefs of whom neither the Mau history nor the Zabú-Oke-Saung give any account. Fu-Sang-Kang had three sons, the elder named Chau-Kang-pha, the second Chau-Zot-pha, and the third Chau-Ka-pha; the second of these was created by his father (and during his lifetime) tsaubwa of Thibo and the first tsaubwa of Taipong, the southern maing, or district, of Theinni. The youngest, Chau-Ka-pha, succeeded his father at Momiet in 571 B.E. or 1209 A.D. He reigned here for eighteen years, but then, after a quarrel with his elder brother, Chau-Kang-pha of Taipong, abdicated and retired to Mogaung, where he spent, according to these dates, *three* years in exile, though it is sometimes spoken of as *five* years. In any case he appears to have been in exile in Mogaung at the time of Sam-Lung-pha's conquest of Asam, and in 1229 A.D. he proceeded to the newly conquered country, and became its first tsaubwa establishing his capital at Hologurri.

The city of Momiet was probably built by Fu-Sang-Kang, but a wall is recorded to have been constructed round it by a subsequent tsaubwa, called Chau-Kai-pha, in 638 B.E. or 1276 A.D. About 1556, in the course of the Pegu king's conquests of the Shan states, Momiet became feudatory to Burma, and as in the case of the others, Buddhism began to spread among the inhabitants.

During the period of its independence of all external rule except that of Mau, Momiet is said to have had sway over the following eight minor tsaubwashes: (1) Bamo; (2) Molai (said to be situated S.E. of Bamo and probably at or near the present Nam Kam); (3) Ungbaung; (4) Mainglung; (5) Thongzei; (6) Thibo; (7) Tagaung; (8) Tsingu.

The following table shows the Asam branch of Shan tsaubwas as sprung from Momiet, and is derived from the Ahom books:—*

* Prinsep (*Indian Antiquities*, Vol. II., *Useful Tables*, &c., p. 273) gives a list of Asam kings which differs to some extent with that given below, but as the latter has been compiled by an Asamese of considerable learning (*viz.*, Raj Sing), and entirely, I believe, from original sources, I have not attempted to correct it.

MOMIET.

Number.	Name.	Relationship to preceding.	COMMENCEMENT OF REIGN.			Length of reign; years.	Capital.	REMARKS.
			Name of Shan year or Lakli.	Burmese era.	A. D.			
1	Fu-Sang-Kang	Mung-raw 34	564	1202	7	Momiet..	Younger brother of Pam-Yau-Pung (No. 28) of Mung-Mau.
2	Chau-Ka-pha ...	3rd son ..	Kap-si ... 41	571	1209	18	Do. ...	In 1227 he fled to Mogaung, and there spent about three years in exile.
	<i>The same</i> ...	Interval	of exile	3		

ASAM.

grs. m. d.

1	<i>The same</i>	Kap-saw ... 1	...	1229	39 4 15	Hologurri	These are sometimes said to have been poisoned by their ministers.
2	Chau-Tui-pha ...	Son ...	Ka-mau ... 40	...	1268	13		
3	Chau-Bin-pha ...	Do. ...	Rai-si ... 53	...	1281	12		
4	Chau-Kan-pha ...	Do. ...	Plek-si ... 5	...	1293	39		
5	Chau-Kran-pha ...	Do. ...	Mung-mut 44	...	1332	32		
6	Chau-Tu-pha ...	Younger brother.	Kat-Mau ... 16	...	1364	12		
	<i>No King</i>	Bung-Mau 28	...	1376	4		
7	Chau-Kham-ti ...	Younger brother.	Dap-mut ... 32	...	1380	9		
	<i>No King</i>	Kap-si ... 41	...	1389	9		
8	Chau-Dang-pha ...	Son ...	Ksa-plaw ... 50	...	1398	9		
9	Chau-Yang-pha ...	Do. ...	Taw-mit ... 59	...	1407	15		
10	Chau-Pok-pha ...	Do. ...	Mung-plaw 14	...	1422	17		
11	Chau-Tsen-pha ...	Do. ...	Kap-singa 31	...	1439	49		
12	Chau-Han-pha ...	Do. ...	Ksa-mut ... 20	...	1488	5		
13	Chau-Pim-pha ...	Do. ...	Plek-saw ... 25	...	1493	4		
14	Chau-Han-maung...	Do. ...	Taw-si ... 29	...	1497	42		
15	Chau-Klen-maung..	Do. ...	Kap-mit ... 11	...	1539	13		
16	Chau-Kam-pha ...	Do. ...	Mung-kiu... 24	...	1552	59		
17	Chau-Tseng-pha ...	Do. ...	Rai-mit ... 23	...	1611	38		
18	Chau-Ram-pha ...	Do. ...	Kap-saw ... 1	...	1649	3		
19	Chau-Tyeng-pha ...	Do. ...	Mung-mau 4	...	1632	2		
20	Chau-Tam-Law ...	Do. ...	Kat-sin ... 6	...	1654	9		
21	Chau-Pong-maung	...	Plek-ngi ... 15	...	1663	7		
22	Chau-Nyat-pha ...	Younger brother.	Dap-raw ... 22	...	1670	2		
23	Chau-Klon-pha ...	Do. ...	Mung-kiu... 24	...	1672	2		
24	Chau-Hong ...	Relation	Kat-plaw ... 26	...	1674	0 1 16	} ...	
25	Goobor Raja ...	Do. ...	Do.	"	0 0 20		
26	Chau-jin-pha ...	Do. ...	Do.	"	2 9 25		

Asam.—(Concluded.)

Number.	Name.	Relationship to preceding.	COMMENCEMENT OF REIGN.			Length of reign, years.	Capital.	REMARKS.
			Name of Shan year or Lakli.	Burmese era.	A.D.			
27	Chau-Doi-pha ...	Relation	Taw-si ... 29	...	1677	2		
28	Chau-Lik-pha ...	Do. ...	Kap-Singa 31	...	1679	2		
						yr. m. d.		
29	Chau-Pat-pha or Gadadar Sing.	Do. ...	Rai-San ... 33	...	1681	14 10 13		
30	Chau-Kron-pha or Rodra Sing.	Son	1695	18 6 0	...	Converted to Bra- manism and built Rung- pore.
31	Chau-Tu-pha or Sira Sing.	Younger brother.	1714	10 3 11		
32	Chau-Nen-pha or Pramot Sing.	Do.	1744	6 10 6		
33	Chau-Rom-pha or Rajeswar Sing.	Do.	1751	17 7 21		
34	Chau-Niu-pha or Lukmi Sing.	Do.	1769	11 6 10		
35	Chau-Hit-Pong-pha or Gaurinath Sing.	Son	1780	14 7 22	...	Invited the aid of a British force to defeat the Muttucks.
36	Komulshwar Sing.	Relation	1795	15 5 10		
37	Chandrakant Sing	Younger brother.	1810	7 1 5	...	Invited a Burmese force to assist in expelling his minister, and delivered over a princess to the King of Burma.
38	Purundur Sing ...	Relation	1817	1 0 4	...	Came from Bengal and deposed the last.
	Again Chandrakant	1818	2 8 0	...	Before this second accession he ob- tained Burmese aid for the ex- pulsion of Pur- under. Was suc- cessful, and was reinstated.
39	Jageswar Sing	1821	3 10 19	...	He was elder bro- ther of the prin- cess, presented by Chandrakant to the king of Burma, and was a vassal of Bur- ma. He was dethroned by the E. I. C. in 1825.

MO-NYN.

Shan name : Mung-Nyang; Pali : probably part of Udigiri-rata or Mogaung.

The tsaubwaship proper may be said to have been included between the Irawaddy on the east and south, the Meza and Uru rivers on the west, and the Mogaung tsaubwaship on the north.

The first king, or chief of Mo-nyin, was of Nora race, and is reported to have founded his dynasty in the year of religion 706 or 162 A.D., but his line was afterwards displaced by the Mau. On account of its central position the history of Mo-nyin is intimately bound up with that of its neighbours, and shows it to have been as often a dependency of one or another of these as an independent state; consequently its history would be exceedingly difficult to trace, but would not be without interest, as at certain periods the Mo-nyin tsaubwas were very powerful and waged successful wars with the Burmese. I have not been able to hear, however, of the existence of any consecutive history of Mo-nyin.

MONEI.

The classical name for the entire state was, I believe, Kamboza, though the name given on Colonel Yule's map of Burma for the present *town* of Monei is Konanda. The original city is, according to Burmese accounts, reported to have been founded in the year 24 of religion or 519 B.C. by one Nga-Chau-kyo, who was the first of a line of independent tsaubwas. In about 1223 Monei was conquered by Sam-lung-pha and became feudatory to Mung-Mau, when a branch of the Momiet line was established in place of that of the old national rulers. In common with most of its neighbours Monei fell to the king of Pegu in about 1556 when Buddhism was introduced and its tsaubwas became vassals of Burma.

The states claimed as having been under the Government of Monei during its independence are: (1) Nyaung-yuei; (2) Mobyey; (3) Yauksauk (or Yatsauk); (4) Legya; (5) Tigyt (said to lie between the Sittang and Karenni, and

S.-W. from Mobyeyi); (6) (Kyaing-Taung (probably a small town on the right bank of the Salween to the east of Monei); (8) Maing-Seik, and sometimes the Mre-Lap Shans.*

THIBO.

Shan name: Tai-po. Pali name, as part of Momiet Thiri-Rata.

The city of Tai-po was founded by a local chief named U dina in the year of religion 120 or 423 B.C., and his dynasty continued through a line of sixteen kings. In the year 624 or 79 B.C. a chief of another dynasty named Chau-Hung-Kam came into power and built a new city measuring 273 *ta* from east to west and 289 *ta* from north to south, the western wall having three gates, and the other three sides two gates each; the wall itself was seven cubits in height. This tsaubwa ruled over 290 villages.†

In the Burmese year 572 or 1210 A.D. Fu-Sang-Kang, tsaubwa of Momiet, placed his second son, Chau-Zot-pha in power at Thibo, and in his person commenced the Mau dynasty in this state. But Thibo, about this time, appears to have declined, while a new city some two miles to the westward sprang up, called Ungbaun. This was either during Chau-Zot-pha's reign or that of one of his immediate successors,

* The country of the Mre-lap, or Mre-lat, Shans is not easily defined. As the words imply, it is a kind of intermediate or vacant district, neither absolutely Burmese nor entirely Shan, and bears a general sense. The region here indicated however lies, roughly speaking, south-east of Ava and extending from the Nattik hills on the east, towards the Irawaddy, in the direction of Myin-Gyan, on the west. The more easterly—hilly—portions are said to have been peopled, formerly, by the Gungs or Guens, the Demon race, now inhabiting the tsaubwaship of Kiang-Tung; the legend being that a demon chief once lived in a town called Kinlay, about a mile north-west of the Nattik pass. He, with his people, was driven from here by King Anauratha after a severe battle, and migrated eastward to the present seat of the tribe, which was then already inhabited by a kindred race of demons with whom, after some contention, they amalgamated, while Kinlay was allowed to become a mass of ruins. Shans and Burmese then settled in the vacated Gung country and were sometimes under Shan tsaubwas and sometimes immediately under Burmese rule, whence the application of the present name.

All kinds of barbarities are attributed to the Gungs or Guens, in their ancient state, and they are probably the race of *Gueos* alluded to as cannibals, by Camoëns, in the lines at the head of this pamphlet.

† The above is from a Burmese source; what follows is from a Shan book in possession of the Thibo tsaubwa who visited Mandalay a few years ago.

and the custom then instituted was for the Momiet tsaubwa at the time being to depute his younger brother or other near relation to rule at the new city under the title of "kun-maing" (royal ruler), while the latter, in his turn, appointed one of his own relations to Thibo. In 904 B.E. or 1542 the Ungbaung kun-maing made over the government of his state to his younger brother and placed his son at the head of affairs at Mobyai, while he himself went to Ava and became king at the invitation of the nobles of that city, who had just put to death the Shan king Chau-Hung-pha, son of the Mo-nyin tsaubwa (or Chau-lung), by whom he had been placed on the throne. The kun-maing remained on the throne of Ava for one year and then retired to a monastery as a priest, when he was succeeded by his son from Mobyai, who reigned until his death, which occurred about two years later—907 B.E. = 1545 A.D.*

Both Thibo and Ungbaung finally fell under the Pegu yoke about 1556 A.D., together with the parent state of Momiet.

According to a rough sketch by the Thibo tsaubwa, who visited Mandalay, the town of Thibo consisted of three forts or walled compounds joined together; about one *daing* (say two miles) to the west or south-west and across a small tributary of the Myt-ngei, called the Nam-po, stood Ungbaung, an oblong city, 600 *ta* by 300, and containing three gates on each face, or twelve in all; the middle gate on the southern face was called the Pegu gate, and the corresponding one on the west face the Momiet gate. At about half a mile to the N.W. of the city stood a square fort among some paddy fields.

* In Sir A. Phayre's translation of the Maha-Raza-Weng (*J. A. S. B.*, 1869, XXXVIII, p. 66) this story is given almost as above. Chau-Hung-pha being there written *Tho-han-hwa*. But it is a minister named Kan-noung, who is said to have retired to a monastery in 905 B.E. while the Kun-maing proceeded to attack Prome. His death is placed at 907 B. E.

BAMO.*

Shan name: Man-mo, or village of the potter (Potter's village); Buddhistical name: Champanagara; Chinese: Sin-Kieh or new street, pronounced in the dialect of Western Yunnan *Sin-gai*, and so named when the village was first transferred from its former site on the Tapeng near where that stream issues from the Kachyen hills.

The village and ruins of Tsampenago (*i.e.*, Champa-nagara) near the Irawaddy and Tapeng confluence are pointed to as the site of the original town, and it is related that in ancient times, out of date, an Indian dynasty reigned there. One prince of this dynasty (whether the first or not it is impossible to ascertain) was called Sitta Raja, who was attacked and dethroned by one Kucha Raja, who after a reign of seven years was swallowed by the earth in punishment for his iniquities, and Sitta again ascended the throne. On this occasion he reigned only seven months, when he died and was succeeded by his son Vilasa supposed to have been Gaudama in a former existence.

This legend is said to have been preached by Gaudama himself, and it forms the theme of a well-known Burmese drama called "Vilasa dzat," where it is enveloped in endless fable, chiefly relating to the charmed life held by Vilasa when a young prince and before his accession, in spite of every effort made by Kusha to destroy him. It is said, however, that there exists a Shan tradition confirming the legend of Vilasa, but whether original, or imported, together with Buddhism from Burma, is doubtful.

At the close of Sitta's dynasty two sons of one Hastet-Deva Raja, of Kusambi, arrived at Champanagara from India, and commenced to reign after first changing the name of the town to Sampala.

* A history of Bamo, in part somewhat similar to the following, has been published by the late Mr. Mason in the *Supplement to the British Burma Gazette* of 7th February 1874. But as I have ascertained that Mr. Mason derived his information from the same native source as myself, I allow this account to stand as original. In Mr. Mason's paper the fable of Vilasa is given at length.

After this another (nameless) dynasty appears to have followed and to have transferred the capital to the opposite bank of the Irawaddy at Kaung Sin, and fourthly the country came under the sway of Asoka of Pataliputra (Dhammathoka of the Burmese), when Tsampenago was again made the capital and was reckoned as one of the 84,000 towns over which he governed, and in each of which he is related to have built a pagoda, a tank, a well, and a rest-house for travellers (zayat). The present Shwe-kena pagoda, close to the ruins of old Tsampenago, is believed to be the one built by Asoka, but there are also three others in the neighbourhood which claim the same origin, though that at Shwe-kena is undoubtedly the most ancient and the most important. The three in question are: (1) that at Hakan on right bank of Irawaddy nearly opposite Tsampenago and known as the Mya-Zadi; (2) the Kauntung pagoda called the Shwe-Zigaung; and (3) the Shwei-Zadi at Bamo. The reason of Asoka's choosing Tsampenago for one set of his pagodas, tanks, &c., is said to be that Buddha had lived there in a former existence in the body of a crow.

But to pass from fable to reality: in the year 400 of the Burmese era or A.D. 1038 a Mau tsaubwa of the Taipong race* placed a "tamon" or pawmaing at Bamo and assumed supreme power over the province; but on Momiet becoming a separate tsaubwaship, under Fu-Sang-Kang in Burmese Era 564 or A.D. 1202, it was constituted a portion of that state, and Momiet pawmaings were appointed as local governors until the year 832 B.E. or 1470 A.D., when a son of the Momiet tsaubwa † named Chau-Lin-pha was appointed tsaubwa and became to a certain extent independent, being only tributary to Momiet like Thibo, Monei, &c.

The line of these tsaubwas then runs as follows:—

1. Chau-Lin-pha	...	B.E. 832	A.D. 1470.	Reigned 12 years.
2. Chau-Haing-pha	...	844	1482	3 "
3. Chau-Hung-pha	...	847	1485	22 "
4. Chau-Swan-pha	...	869	1507	11 "
5. Chau-Tu-pha	...	880	1518	25 "
6. Chau-Sauk-pha	...	905	1543	39 "

* The date would point to Kun-Kwot-pha (see table p. 26 above).

† Probably one Chau-Lai-Khei.

During this tsaubwa's reign Momiet became tributary to Burma and with it Bamo. He died in 944 B.E. when the line continues thus:—

7.	Chau-Yung-pha	... B.E. 944	A.D. 1582.	Reigned 6 years.
8.	Chau-Siu-pha	... 950	1588	15 "
9.	Chau-Sain-lung	... 965	1603	31 "
10.	Chau-San-pha	... 996	1634	12 "
11.	Chau-Lo-san	... 1008	1646	1 year.
12.	Chau-Lin-pha	... 1009	1647	6 years.
13.	Chau-Sok-pha	... 1015	1653	15 "
14.	Chau-Ngaug-pha	... 1030	1668	1 year.

He went to Yunnan and persuaded the Chinese to send an army and invade Burma. The Burmese however defeated the Chinese and Chau Ngauk-pha fled to China;* the general of the Burmese army (No. 15) then assumed the Government of Bamo.

15.	Mingaun, Bur. Genl.	B.E. 1031	A.D. 1669.	Reigned 5 years.
16.	Nge Myat, Bur. Merchant.	1036.	1674	11 "
17.	Chau-Pi-pha	... 1047	1885	21 "
18.	Chau-Tun-pha	... 1068	1706	13 "
19.	Fo-U	... 1081	1719	1 year.

Fled to China.

20.	Chau-Maing-pha	... B.E. 1082	A.D. 1720.	Reigned 7 years.
-----	----------------	---------------	------------	------------------

He died at Ava while on a visit to the king of Burma.

21.	Chau-Tung-Ngei	B.E. 1089	A.D. 1727.	Reigned 7 years.
-----	----------------	-----------	------------	------------------

He was killed at Shwe-gu by his minister when, for one year, no tsaubwa ruled.

22.	Haw Kit	... B.E. 1097	A.D. 1735.	Reigned 7 years.
-----	---------	---------------	------------	------------------

He was tsaubwa of Molei.

23.	Chau-Tung Ngei II.	1104	1742	25 years.
-----	--------------------	------	------	-----------

During part of Chau-Tung-Ngei's reign he is said to have freed himself of the Burmese yoke, but a war between China and Burma took place and he fled to China, when a Burmese general called Bola Nauratha took possession of Kauntung (distant about 13 miles from Bamo), and governed the province of

* For a detailed account of this and the following wars, see *Col. Burney, J. A. S. B.*, 1837, Vol. VI., p. 123 *et seq.*

Bamo for three years, during which period an almost continuous war was carried on with China, the Shans of Theinni, Mogaung and Bamo siding with the Chinese. The next, and last, Bamo tsaubwa was :—

24. Chau-Myot-Aung ... B.E. 1132. A.D. 1770.

He was son of the tsaubwa of Momiet and 80 years of age when he assumed the government of Bamo; his reign was consequently short, and at his death the Burmese began to appoint woons to administer the tsaubwaship as a Burmese district. From B.E. 1177 to 1208 or 1815 to 1846, however, the district was "eaten" by an Asamese princess, a wife of King Tharawady.

NOTE.

THE CHUTYA, OR SUTYA, OF UPPER ASAM.

It has been shown above, from the Mau chronicles, that the first migration of Shans into the Brahmaputra Valley occurred early in the 14th century, when the Mau army invaded the country from the south-east; and from the following brief epitome of the history of the Sutyas in Upper Asam, it will be seen that it was upon this people that the brunt of the Shan conquest first fell. The book from which it is derived is a small Asamese manuscript work, brought from Asam by a Burmese commander shortly before the first Anglo-Burmese war, and now in possession of the King of Burma. From this it appears that the country was situated to the west of the Udigiri Mountains (i.e., the Brahmakund and ranges bounding Khamti on the west); to the north of the hills inhabited by the Cacharis and Nangota (or naked) Nagas; while towards the west it extended as far as the country of the Kusan, said to be a Hindoo tribe dwelling formerly in the neighbourhood of Bisnath; and towards the north as far as the hills of the Amut Miri.

There were three races inhabiting the country, all of Hindoo origin, viz., the Sutyas or Chutyas, the Burahi (or pig race), and the Moran, also called Moamaria or Muttuck. But the Sutyas were the ruling tribe, and the other two subordinate to it. The first Sutyas king recorded was one Asambhinna, who, with his seven brothers, dwelt on the banks of the Sri Lohit or Brahmaputra, but at what town or village is not indicated. During his reign a Brahmin came from Benares and converted the whole of the eight brothers to Brahminism. This Brahmin was much respected for his learning and piety, and Asambhinna gave him his daughter in marriage. At Asambhinna's death the surviving brothers quarrelled among themselves on the subject of the succession, but eventually agreed to place the Brahmin on the throne. On the death of the latter, however, a descendant of Asambhinna came into power; he was called Indra Deva Raja, and reigned for 30 years. After him followed 31 kings lineally descended from him, the last of whom was called Lekroy Raja. The names of these kings are given and are mostly of a Hindoo type, but as no dates or events of importance are recorded, these in themselves are of no value. The thirty-two reigns from Indra Deva, inclusive, downwards, aggregate 554 years (or an average of $17\frac{1}{2}$ years each), but the length of Asambhinna's and the Brahmin's reigns are not given.*

Lekroy Raja died leaving four sons called, respectively, Burora, Maisura, Kolita, and Kossi Raja, but before the succession had been fixed Samlungpha arrived with a Mau army, and the brothers being

* Supposing these two first reigns to have been in the same proportion, the 34 reigns would aggregate 589, and Asambhinna's accession would consequently come to about 640 A.D. if we place Samlungpha's invasion in 1229 A. D.

divided among themselves made only a feeble resistance. Burora (surnamed Buruk) was killed in battle with the Shans; Maisura (surnamed Maikron) fled with a number of followers to Maing-Bing;* Kolita, followed by a considerable force of his countrymen, also fled, but to the westward across the mountains near the Sri Lohit, where he established a kingdom; the fourth brother, Kossi Raja, was captured by the Shans and agreed to become a feudatory. Samlungpha then placed a Tamon, or Governor, on the Sutyra throne and returned to Mogaung; but after five months the Tamon was poisoned by Kossi Raja, who seized the power and ruled for a period of six months, when a Shan force was again sent into the country, which defeated Kossi Raja and obliged him to take refuge in Cachar. On this occasion the Shans are said to have been commanded by Chau-Kaa-pha, the younger brother or cousin of the Mogaung tsaubwa, but the name and event, taken together, appear to establish him as the son of Fu-Sang-Kang of Momiet,† whatever might have been his relationship to the Mogaung tsaubwa.

Perhaps the only remarkable point in the above is the mention of Kolita having established a kingdom to the west of Sutyra and beyond the range flanking the Brahmaputra on the north, for it is almost precisely in this locality that Captain Neufville points to an isolated but civilised people of that name. He writes ‡—"The country to the eastward of Bhot [Bhutan] and the northward of Sadiya, extending on the plain beyond the mountains, is said to be possessed by a powerful nation called Kolitas or Kultas, who are described as having attained a high degree of advancement and civilisation, equal to any of the nations of the east. The power, dominion, and resources of the Kultra Raja are stated to exceed, by far, those of Asam, under its most flourishing circumstances, and in former times a communication appears to have been kept up between the states, now long discontinued.

"To this nation are attributed the implements of husbandry and domestic life, washed down by the flood of the Dihong before-mentioned.§ Of their peculiar habits and religion nothing is known, though they are considered to be Hindoos, a circumstance which, from their locality, I think most unlikely, and in all probability arising merely from some fancied analogy of sound, the word *Kolita* being used in Asamese to signify the *Khaet* caste."

I am particular in italicising the last sentence, as the natural inclination would be to connect the fugitive prince, Kolita, with the learned caste of that name in Asam, and the more especially as the name of his brother, Kossi Raja, would seem to have some affinity to the inferior Asamese caste of Koch, and that therefore the whole story might be a local Hindoo invention for fabricating pedigrees for these

* Said to be near the present Bisnath.

† See table, page 51.

‡ *Asiatick Researches*, XVI., p. 345.

§ *Ibid.*

castes after Brahminical fashion. But if we can assume with Captain Neufville that a really separate people exist under this name, the case is otherwise, and Ritter, the only commentator on Neufville's original information that I know of, appears to accept the story.*

Captain Wilcox, who was a companion of Neufville, publishes an itinerary from native sources of a route leading from Durrung, through Tawang, to the Kolita country, which gives a distance of 16 marches; and one of the Trigonometrical Survey Pundits, in his late journey from Leh to Lassa and thence to Asam,† passed through a country called *Mon-huil* (Mon-land) situated immediately to the north of Tawang, or 13 marches from Udalgiri in the Durrung District, where the inhabitants, called Mon-pas "differ materially in language, dress, manners, and appearance from the inhabitants of Tibet, and resemble in many respects the Dukpas of the Bhutan country on the west." He does not make any mention of their being of Hindoo race, or of their having any similarity to the Hindoos of Asam, but mentions that they are a settled people and carry on a considerable trade, while their country, apparently, is fertile and well-cultivated. All but the name therefore points to the land of the Kolita indicated by Neufville, and it would be interesting to ascertain what connection exists between these two modern accounts, whatever may be the value of the tradition of the Suty prince's flight.

The tribal name of "Mon," as given by the Pundit, is defined by Csoma de Körös, in his Tibetan Dictionary, as a general name for the hill people between the plains of India and Tibet, and it is quite possible that Mon-pas in different localities should have distinguishing names. The syllable "*pas*," it may be remarked, means simply "people" or "race;" thus Mon-pas, people of Mon or Mon-huil (Mon-country); Hor-pas, people of Hor or Hor-huil, &c.

The connection between the Mon and Hor of these southern Tibetan regions with the Mun-da and Hora (or Kols) of Chota Nagpur, who in their turn are held to be connected with the Mon or Talain race of Lower Burma, it would be beside the object of this note to discuss.

(See *Sir A. Phayre* in *J. A. S. B.*, XLII., pt. I., page 35: also *Dr. Mason* in "*Burma, &c.*," and *Captain Trotter's Report* before quoted.)

* *Erdkunde*, IV., p. 388.

† *Selections, Berghal Government*, No. XXIII. (1855), p. 127, and *Asiatick Researches*, Vol. XVII, p. 454.

‡ See *Report on Trans-Himalayan Explorations*, 1873-74-75 by *Captain H. Trotter*, R. E., pp. 69, 82, and 90.

